

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of San Francisco (Cal.) Advertising Club and Common Council of Philadelphia, Pa., against abolition of pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of National Farmers' Union, Palatka, Fla., urging passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Sacramento (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce and sundry citizens of California, protesting against certain sections of the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. C. Rawley, protesting against passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429, relative to excluding liquor advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Marlin Arms Corporation, New Haven, Conn., relative to need of machine guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William T. Goldsborough, of San Francisco, Cal., relative to enlargement and preservation of national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of W. T. Hornaday, of New York City, urging passage of the game-sanctuary bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. F. Kuhn, Stockton, Cal., protesting against placing of postmasters under civil service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Stacy, Cal., against bill to provide postal-zone rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill., protesting against amendment to section 6 of the District of Columbia appropriation bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Personal Liberty League of Maryland, protesting against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of R. E. Earnest, of New York City, favoring passage of House bill 19433; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Alfred Lewishon, of New York, against passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROUSE: Telegram signed by W. C. Morgan, Eugene Mosley, A. B. Clem, W. H. Pearce, D. L. Bell, Dr. W. P. Bell, and J. W. McMahon, of Trimble County, Ky., protesting against the Bankhead bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, telegram signed by W. H. McIntyre, H. H. Schiermer, C. R. Barclay, C. P. Harwood, B. F. Holsclaw, Tom Wood, George Tandy, George McCord, Joe Pecar, N. G. Dennison, Shelly Poland, Harry Pollard, Leonard Miles, B. F. Butler, H. H. McKay, A. Abots, John Neal, John Whittaker, Al Bowman, Joe Morrison, W. B. Colbert, H. J. Bell, W. H. Cook, G. P. Heath, W. R. Heath, and C. B. Clem, of Trimble County, Ky., urging defeat of the Bankhead bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, telegram signed by Standard Printing Works, Alban Wolff, R. J. Jameson, Matt Crolley, Semple & Schram, and Kyle Printing Co., of Covington, Ky., opposing Senate bill 4429, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Ruthenian National Union, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 230, looking to the relief of the Ruthenians; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 7, 1917.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 6, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hardwick	Lea, Tenn.	Page
Beckham	Hollis	Lewis	Pittman
Borah	Hughes	Lodge	Polindexter
Brady	Husting	McCumber	Pomerene
Bryan	James	McLean	Ransdell
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.	Reed
Curtis	Jones	Martine, N. J.	Robinson
Fall	Kenyon	Myers	Saulsbury
Gallinger	Kirby	Norris	Shaftroth
Gronna	Lane	Oliver	Sheppard

Sherman
Simmons
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Mich.

Smith, S. C.
Smoot
Sterling
Thomas

Tillman
Townsend
Vardaman
Wadsworth

Weeks
Williams
Works

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] through illness.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] are absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. I was requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WORKS obtained the floor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram, which will be read.

The telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., February 6, 1917.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
Washington, D. C.:

It is with pleasure that the directors of the American Aircraft Co., of Indiana, offer to the Government of the United States their loyal cooperation in providing an adequate aerial defense.

THE AMERICAN AIRCRAFT CO.,
By A. G. FRENEY, President.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from California yield to me just a moment for a formal matter?

Mr. WORKS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HARDWICK. Out of order I desire to present telegrams from certain citizens of Georgia respecting the pending revenue bill. I move that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARDWICK. I also present a memorial of the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., respecting harbor improvements at that city, which I move be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WORKS. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With the permission of the Senator from California at the request of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who is detained by illness, I ask that the telegram I send to the desk may be read.

The telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., February 4, 1917.

Senator THOMAS P. GORE,
Washington, D. C.:

Mass meeting held at International College to-day. A unanimous appeal was made in the name of millions helpless to express themselves that you use your great office in crushing the war gods about to plunge our country into blood, death, and destruction. Give us justice at home before foreign regulation.

JOHN J. CARNEY, Attorney.
KATE BARNARD.
Dr. JAS. ARMSTRONG, President.
FRED HOLT, Treasurer.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will the Senator from California yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, but I hope that Senators will defer these telegrams until a later time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to present a telegram in the nature of a petition, which I ask be printed in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., February 6, 1917.

Hon. GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We petition you as our representative in Congress to use your utmost efforts to preserve peace. We should not engage in war except to save our honor or national existence. No situation exists at present, and while the voices of jingoes and munitions manufacturers are louder, the mass of the people oppose war. A blockade of Great Britain by Germany is of no greater moment than a blockade of Germany by Great Britain to the American people. In so far as we are concerned, the blockade by one belligerent of the other should be no cause of war. No urgent necessity or impending calamity requires us to break the blockade of either belligerent. Before the bloody scourge of war is brought upon us, with all its attendant dangers and calamities, we ask that the people who must do the actual fighting and undergo

the hardships and danger be consulted and given opportunity to determine by vote whether they want to give up their peaceful vocations and engage in further crushing civilization in the mad shambles of Europe. President Wilson was elected with the expectation that he would keep the country out of war, and we ask you to aid him in his efforts to that end. We pledge our loyalty to America and urge you to show your loyalty by keeping us out of war.

Adopted by mass meeting of over 1,000 citizens, who request you to lay this resolution before the Senate and House of Representatives.

THOMAS MANNIX, *Chairman.*

OUR RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, some days ago I gave notice that this morning I would address the Senate on the subject of our relations with Germany. Since that time the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] offered a resolution bearing on that question which in effect is an indorsement of what has been done by the President of the United States up to the present time. I am not going to undertake to discuss that resolution at this time because it is not now before the Senate. I may desire to do so when it comes up for consideration. What I expect to do now is to address the Senate on the general subject of our relations with Germany growing out of the present situation. Before doing so I should like to present two or three telegrams bearing upon that question and have them read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

CHICAGO, ILL., February 7, 1917.

We thank you most heartily for the courageous stand you are taking against the Stone resolution of indorsing Wilson's break with Germany. Fight on and you will win. We do not want war with Germany.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE C. BARTHOLOMEW AND FAMILY.

GREENVILLE, PA., February 6, 1917.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand for peace. Strive to get Washington's ear for Him who said, Put away thy sword and avert a spread to our land of the Almighty's plague of Europe in war.

WM. LOOSER.

PORTLAND OREG., February 6, 1917.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Oregon citizens in mass meeting assembled depend upon you to use your utmost efforts to preserve peace and highly appreciate your noble efforts of the past. The Nation does not want war. President Wilson was reelected because he kept us out of war, and is expected to keep us out of war in the future. The jingo press does not represent the true sentiment of the people.

THOMAS MANNIX, *Chairman.*

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I submit a telegram from Chicago, Ill., and a letter from an outlying town in another part of the State. I wish to state that I shall submit no further telegrams or letters on the subject named, because of the very large number that I have received. I selected these two as fairly indicative of the sentiment of the great majority I have received, which aggregate several hundred. I ask that the telegram be read first and the letter following.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNION STOCK YARDS, ILL., February 5, 1917.

Hon. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
Care Mr. Porter, 424 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was adopted unanimously at the annual meeting of the Goodman Manufacturing Co.: "Resolved, That the stockholders of the Goodman Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, in regular meeting assembled, commend unreservedly the late action of the President of the United States in the maintenance of American rights and national honor, and pledge to the use of our Government in their defense, upon the Government's own terms, anything the company has or can provide."

FRANK S. WASHBURN, *President.*

ADDIEVILLE, ILL., February 4, 1917.

Senator SHERMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to urge you to use your influence with the President to come out boldly on the side of the allies and civilization and use every honorable means to crush Prussian militarism.

Yours, respectfully,

Mrs. ELLA SCHMIDT,
H. SCHMIDT.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, we have severed our long-time friendly relations with the Imperial German Government. This

is a first and long step toward war with that country. We may be about to plunge our people into the horrors of the dreadful war that is now dealing death and destruction in the countries of Europe, and are encouraging other neutral and peaceful nations to follow us in this fatal course. If this shall happen, as now seems almost inevitable, we are assuming the fearful responsibility of leading not only our own country but other nations now at peace into the most gigantic and murderous war the world has ever known. By our act we will make this an almost worldwide sanguinary struggle, that means the sacrifice of millions of lives, the destruction of the happiness of millions of now peaceful and contented homes, the peace and tranquillity of our own and other neutral nations, and the waste of untold millions of property.

Mr. President, can we be justified, will we ever be excused by future generations for taking this course, involving with unerring certainty the fearful consequences that must inevitably follow it? Can we in the years to come satisfy our own consciences that by such a course we, as the responsible representatives of this country, are serving the best interests of the peace-loving people of a free Republic or of humanity?

The President has made the first fatal move. The next step that will plunge our people into a bloody conflict, if taken, must be ours. Congress alone has the power under our Government to declare war. So, if we go to war with Germany, it will be by our act and we alone will be responsible for the consequences. The President has been applauded for making this first move toward war. Doubtless thousands of the American people, little comprehending what must follow, would applaud Congress if it should at once declare war against Germany. The public mind has been prepared for such a mad course by the unseemly and unpatriotic propaganda in favor of preparedness for war. The war spirit, the desire for conflict, have been insidiously instilled into the minds of our people by this selfish agitation in favor of preparedness for the shedding of human blood. Preparedness for war has been established in the minds of the people without the physical means of making that condition of mental preparedness effective. The minds of the people were made ready to accept and applaud an act that means war. The act of the President that is expected to lead to this result has been accepted by the public mind thus falsely educated and inspired. Mentally the good, peace-loving people of the Nation have by this means been led astray from the paths of peace and made ready to accept the prospect of physical warfare with rejoicing. The act of the President to such a distorted mind is accepted as courageous, even heroic. And, Mr. President, this is looked upon in this time, when most of the world is convulsed with war, as an act of patriotism.

Now, Mr. President, let us stop a moment to look this appalling situation squarely in the face, consider whether we are leading this Nation and why, and ask ourselves whether or not we are justified in the course so far entered upon and in carrying it out to its legitimate and fearful consequences. Now is the time to take counsel with ourselves and our consciences. Very soon it may be too late. War once entered upon, however much we may desire it, we can not draw back. The Nation once at war must and will receive our earnest, loyal, and undivided support. Have we the moral courage to do the things now that will avoid the war? To avoid it now may call for a higher degree of courage and real and unalloyed patriotism than to enter upon it or even to pursue it to the end. If ever true and unselfish patriotism and the highest standard of moral courage, courage far more important and often more difficult than mere physical courage, on the part of public officials was called for, it is now. If we fail now the blood of millions of people may be on our hands.

I know how ready human beings are to resent encroachments on their rights and how hard it is to forbear and forgive such offenses. In the minds of too many people it is looked upon as cowardly and pusillanimous to forgive any offense. Time was when personal offenses, or even trivial affronts, could be settled only by the spilling of blood on the field of honor and the man who failed or refused to resort to that means of redress was looked upon as a coward and a poltroon. But, in modern and more civilized times, to engage in a duel has become disgraceful and made unlawful. Unfortunately this is not yet so with nations. If it had been the world would have been spared the terrible war now raging in Europe and which is threatening to invade this continent.

It is my purpose, with the indulgence of the Senate, to consider whether we are justified, in the interest of our own people, in pursuing the course we have now entered upon in our dealings with Germany.

The President, in announcing to Congress that he had severed diplomatic relations with the Imperial Government of Germany, has recounted in part the events leading up to this unfortunate step. He commences with the note of this Government, of April 8 last, to the Government of Germany, induced by the sinking of the *Sussex* by a German submarine and the consequent loss of the lives of American citizens. I shall review the correspondence between the two Governments, commencing with the note mentioned, in a moment. Before doing so I want to go back a little further. In any attempt to deal frankly with this situation, we must search our own national conscience and consider how far, if at all, our own conduct has contributed to the unfortunate situation in which we now find ourselves.

The first and most cruel wrong done to the rights of American citizens by the German Government was in sinking the *Lusitania*, which resulted in the loss of many American citizens. That it was a cruel and unjust wrong to our people and to the Nation no one, certainly no American citizen, will presume to deny. But, sir, it is well for us to consider in this connection how far we ourselves, by our own course of action, contributed to this loss of American lives. At the very time of this occurrence we were supplying to the enemies of Germany arms and munitions of war to enable them to carry on the war against that country with whom we were at peace. The *Lusitania*, a passenger ship, was loaded with these missiles of death. Many a German soldier had met his death in the trenches, many others had returned to their homes maimed for life, many widows and orphans were mourning their dead as the result of the nefarious trade of American citizens in war munitions. Before the *Lusitania* sailed warning was given that she would be torpedoed if she attempted to cross the ocean freighted with a cargo that meant death and destruction to German subjects.

Our Government knew what was threatened, but we allowed the ship to sail, carrying American citizens into the very jaws of death. Germany was fighting for her life. So were England and France and the other nations engaged in the war. What could have been expected of Germany under such circumstances? What moral right had we to tempt her to this fearful act by this threat against the lives of her people? This Government can not shield itself from the fearful responsibility it is bound to accept for this dreadful tragedy. We have continued from that time on to aid the enemies of Germany in the same way. I have consistently opposed it from the beginning. We have not been neutral as a nation; many of our people have not attempted to conceal the fact of their unneutrality. If we had been wholly neutral, as we professed to be, we would never have been brought to our present relations with Germany. Great Britain has persistently violated our rights on the sea as a neutral nation. She has searched our ships, rifled our mails, and in other ways treated our rights with contempt. We have borne these wrongs as patiently and with as great a degree of forbearance as if we had been the ally of Great Britain instead of being a neutral nation.

Mr. President, this was the unhappy condition of things affecting our relations with Germany when the *Sussex* was sunk and more American lives sacrificed. Certainly Germany had no reason to feel kindly toward us. She must be judged, as we must, by the conditions as they then existed; conditions brought about by us for merely commercial gain, at the expense of German lives. These conditions were not mentioned by the President in his message. We would all be glad to forget them. But the situation that now confronts us, that may mean war for our country, is too serious to permit of evasion or any attempt to escape the consequences of our own mercenary acts.

This brings me to the matter of the President's message in which he expresses his belief that he was justified in severing our friendly relations with the German Government. It is not my purpose to question the good faith of the President in taking this step. I assume without question he has taken the course that he felt it his duty to take as the Chief Magistrate of the Nation. However much I may differ from him, I must give him credit for conscientious motives and patriotic purposes in a matter so grave and important.

But, Mr. President, I do differ from him. With a profound sense of my own responsibility as a representative of the American people, I protest against this or any other movement that tends toward war with Germany for no greater cause than has yet been given us. It is charged against the German Government that she not only violated the rights of American citizens on the sea, but that she has violated her solemn promise, made to this Government, not to further engage in the sort of submarine warfare that resulted in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. That Germany has violated the rights of our people on the sea, under international law, no one can deny. But so has Great Britain, and so would any other belligerent nation fighting for

existence, if necessary for her success. So would we do, I apprehend, under the same circumstances. So as to that phase of the controversy the question is, Should we go to war with Germany on that account? I can not bring myself to believe that we, serving the best interests of our people, should go to any such extreme.

Now, sir, let us look for a moment at the correspondence between this country and Germany and see whether that country has violated any promise made to us as to the future course of submarine warfare to be conducted by her. In the first *Sussex* note the President said to the Imperial German Government:

If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States considers the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether.

In this note we declared that unless Germany—

Should declare and effect an abandonment of its present method of submarine warfare—

We should have—

no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether.

This was a most unfortunate statement, we may call it threat, for us to make. It put the President in the position that compelled him either to back down or do what he has now done, sever our relations with that country. It was exceedingly unwise to say in advance, without qualification, that this Government would have no other choice. It had another choice as I shall presently show, a choice that would insure our continued peace and not involve us in war. But the German Government submitted to this demand in the following language:

The German Government is prepared to do its utmost to confine the operations of war for the rest of its duration to the fighting forces of the belligerents, thereby also insuring the freedom of the seas, a principle upon which the German Government believes now, as before, to be in agreement with the Government of the United States.

The German Government, guided by this idea, notifies the Government of the United States that the German naval forces have received the following orders: "In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared a naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance."

However, this promise not to pursue the then course of submarine warfare was not without reservation or qualification. It was said further in this same note:

Neutrals can not expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interests, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law.

Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality; and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand, knowing that the Government of the United States has repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principles of the freedom of the seas, from whatever quarter it has been violated.

It is true that our Government did not accept this reservation. Our second note contained this clause:

The Government of the United States feels it necessary to state that it takes for granted that the Imperial German Government does not intend to imply that the maintenance of its newly announced policy is in any way contingent upon the course or result of diplomatic negotiations between the Government of the United States and any other belligerent Government, notwithstanding the fact that certain passages in the Imperial Government's note of the 4th instant might appear to be susceptible of that construction.

In order, however, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the Government of the United States notifies the Imperial Government that it can not for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and noncombatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative.

But, as the President says in his message, the German Government made no reply to this note. Consequently, the reservation of the purpose to again pursue the kind of warfare to which we objected in the circumstances named still stands and was never withdrawn. This being so, we can not justly base our own warlike movement on any breach of promise not to reengage in this objectionable sort of warfare, for there has been no such breach. So we had greater cause to sever our relations with Germany as the result of the *Sussex* incident than we have now, because that was an overt act against our neutral rights, while the action we have now taken is founded on a mere threat to commit similar acts in the future. To have been entirely consistent we might better have waited until the threatened act had been committed.

But, sir, let me go a little further and ask whether we would be justified in plunging our Nation into this great war because our rights on the sea are being violated by Germany as a war measure. Of course, the President was right in his position that Germany could not, in a legal sense, be excused for violating our rights because some other nation was violating Germany's rights, as well as our own, in the same way. I am not discussing the question on the basis of legal or international right. Everybody knows that the rules of international law can not stand in case of actual war between nations. They never have and they never will.

No nation, not even our own, would submit to be destroyed by war if it could save itself by breaking the rules of international law as it affects neutral as well as belligerent nations. It will violate the law and take the consequences whatever they may be. It is idle to expect anything else.

Now, Mr. President, this was precisely Germany's case. It was the case of Great Britain and France. They have violated our international rights just as plainly and conspicuously as has Germany but not in the same way. It was the avowed purpose of the enemies of Germany to deprive her of the benefits of the open sea and, as incidental to their purpose to starve the German people into submission, they deprived our and other neutral nations of the freedom of commerce on the sea. Our ships and others carrying our products, not to Germany, but to other neutral nations, were seized, the cargoes held, and our mails rifled. Let us assume that all this was done as a war measure against Germany and not an act of aggression against us. But so is the act of Germany directed against her enemies and not against us. She may do it in a more brutal and more effective way but one is as much an encroachment on our rights as the other and should be judged by the same standard. Therefore we can not consistently sever our relations with Germany and continue them with Great Britain. But, sir, was the President right in saying to Germany that we would, if she continued her then mode of warfare, have no choice but to sever our friendly relations with her? On the contrary there is another and far better choice open to us and one that leads to our continued peace while the choice made means almost certain war.

The German Government has declared a danger zone about its enemies and given notice that any vessels found in that zone, with certain exceptions, will be sunk. What should be our choice under such conditions? I say to keep our ships and our people out of this danger zone until the war is over or the embargo removed. Oh, but my belligerent but well-meaning friends say this would be cowardly and beneath the dignity of a great Nation or one of its citizens. May God protect this Nation from that kind of courage. To avoid the horrors of war this act of prudence on the part of our Government would be a great act of moral courage by a great country that should be a worthy and patriotic example to all the nations of the world.

Of course the Government is in duty bound to protect its citizens abroad as well as at home; but the best and surest protection it can afford them now is to keep them out of this danger zone. It would mean a temporary suspension of trade and the loss of a few thousands of dollars to a very few people. But what would this be to the millions of dollars lost, to say nothing of the sacrifice of thousands of lives by going to war to protect this trade on the high seas? American citizens in Mexico have been compelled by the Government to abandon their permanent homes, lose everything they had in the world, and become homeless and destitute refugees to keep us out of war with that country. Why not be consistent and apply the same rule here?

And so of the individual citizen whose rights are thus invaded. To unselfishly surrender that right by remaining outside of the danger zone, thus protecting his country from the perils of war, would be an act of patriotism and devotion to the best interests of humanity worthy of the highest commendation. And, sir, if any citizen is so unpatriotic as not to do this thing, then the Government should compel him to do it and thus keep our country out of war. And why should this not be done? Suppose there were a riot on one of the streets of Washington dangerous to the lives of citizens in that locality. Any citizen would have the right to travel the street, but would not any sensible and prudent man for his own protection, and as a means of suppressing the riot for the public good, keep out of the danger zone, and would not the police use force, if necessary, to keep the people off the street? Most certainly this would be done, and no one would question its wisdom or its propriety. Then why should not this same thing be done, by force if necessary, where two nations are fighting, resulting in a zone where noncombatants can not enter without endangering their lives or their property and imperiling the peace of their country?

I insist that neither a private citizen nor the President nor the Congress of the United States can be justified in driving this Nation into war or endangering its peace by any such false sense of courage or national prestige or dignity.

Mr. President, my term of service here will terminate in a few days. I may not be called upon to assume further responsibility in this grave and important matter. I have felt constrained, under existing circumstances, to express my views on the subject now, as we may be on the eve of taking the final step that commits the Nation to the arbitrament of war.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I have a telegram, just received since the Senator from California commenced his remarks, which I believe he would be pleased to have read into the Record.

Mr. WORKS. Very well.

Mr. BRADY. I ask the Secretary to read the telegram I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

NAMPA, IDAHO, February 6, 1917.

Senator JAMES A. BRADY.

Washington, D. C.:

We appeal to you to consider Bryan's statement to American people urging official joint conference of neutral nations to consider safeguarding common rights at sea before war move by American Government.

H. A. PARTRIDGE,

Rev. GATES YOUNG,

Pastor First Presbyterian Church of Nampa.

Rev. FATHER J. P. RIES, S. M.

H. C. BRADLEY,

Ex-State Representative.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Holls	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Husting	Norris	Smoot
Brady	James	Owen	Stone
Bryan	Jones	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
Chilton	Kirby	Polinder	Tillman
Clark	La Follette	Pomeroy	Underwood
Coit	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Vardaman
Fall	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lewis	Shafroth	Watson
Gallinger	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Gronna	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Harding	McLean	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. JAMES. I desire to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution I proposed on the day before yesterday, relating to the President's message in joint session on the 3d instant, be now laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, hearing no objection, lays before the Senate the following resolution.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 351, submitted by Mr. STONE on the 5th instant:

Whereas the President has, for the reasons stated in his address delivered to the Congress in joint session on February 3, 1917, severed diplomatic relations with the Imperial German Government by the recall of the American ambassador at Berlin and by handing his passports to the German ambassador at Washington; and

Whereas, notwithstanding this severance of diplomatic intercourse, the President has expressed his desire to avoid conflict with the Imperial German Government; and

Whereas the President declared in his said address that if in his judgment occasion should arise for further action in the premises on the part of the Government of the United States he would submit the matter to the Congress and ask the authority of the Congress to use such means as he might deem necessary for the protection of American seamen and people in the prosecution of their peaceful and legitimate errands on the high seas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate approves the action taken by the President as set forth in his address delivered before the joint session of the Congress, as above stated.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JONES. What has become of the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution has taken its place by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES. I did not understand that the request was put to the Senate to lay aside the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair said if there was no objection it would be laid before the Senate.

Mr. JONES. I desire to object to setting aside the unfinished business. I think the matter ought to be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. STONE. The unfinished business is the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STONE. I think there will be no difficulty in getting that up at any time.

Mr. JONES. I do not give consent to laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. I was sitting here listening to the proceedings. The Chair submitted the question and asked if there was objection; paused; there was no objection, and he recognized the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JONES. I was sitting here just the same as the Senator from Massachusetts, and I was listening for a statement as to whether the unfinished business should be set aside. I supposed the resolution was simply laid before the Senate for discussion. I had no objection to that, but I do object to laying aside the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will immediately follow the disposition of the resolution. It is only temporarily laid aside.

Mr. JONES. But I desire to object to its being temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I make that request.

Mr. JONES. I want an opportunity to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can not be two things pending at the same time before the Senate.

Mr. JONES. I appreciate that, but I object to laying aside the unfinished business to take up the resolution.

Mr. STONE. What is the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, assuming that there was no objection whatever, laid the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. STONE. What is, then, before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington says he did not hear what the Chair said and he is objecting now.

Mr. JONES. No, the Senator from Washington did not hear any request made to lay aside the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We will cut the Gordian knot by laying the resolution before the Senate at the present time, if there be no objection.

Mr. JONES. I object to laying it before the Senate if it means setting aside the unfinished business.

Mr. STONE. It has been laid before the Senate and read.

Mr. JONES. If the Senate desires by motion to take up the resolution and displace the unfinished business, I suppose it can do it, but I object to laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask for information if it is in order now, having charge of the unfinished business, for me to make a request that it be temporarily laid aside. I think that will meet the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. JONES. I object to laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution No. 351.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I shall address the Senate at this time quite briefly, but before speaking directly to the resolution read from the desk I desire to read a short cable dispatch which I clipped from the Sunday issue of a Washington paper:

LONDON, February 4.

America's break with Germany to-day brought together a large number of prominent Americans in London.

A meeting, hurriedly and informally arranged, immediately took up plans for the care of Americans now in Germany and assistance to them in case they wish to return to America or to England.

Upon the Americans in London will fall a vast amount of activity connected with the probable exodus of United States subjects—

I pause here to interpolate that probably the foreign gentleman who penned this cablegram is not aware that the people who owe allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States are in the Constitution described as "citizens," not "subjects"; and while they are subject to the laws of the United States and of the States of which they are severally residents, the true type of the American prefers to be described as a citizen rather than as a subject—

Upon the Americans in London will fall a vast amount of activity connected with the probable exodus of United States subjects from the central countries, and plans are being made to be of every possible assistance to the embassy here.

THOUSANDS LINE STREETS.

Thousands of Englishmen lined the streets of the West End to-day and cheered as members of the American colony paraded the streets to the American Embassy.

Every American in London to-day is a hero. The attitude of the English people, heretofore indifferent—at times almost antagonistic—has changed to that of enthusiastic approbation.

The tune of "The Star-Spangled Banner" was greeted by tumultuous applause at every public gathering. The staid Englishmen, usually apathetic to every tune save "God, Save the King," were stirred to-day by the American anthem to the heights of enthusiasm which marks the rendition of "Dixie" south of the Mason-Dixon line.

WILSON CHEERED.

The picture of President Wilson displayed last night at theaters and movie houses was cheered tumultuously.

A great crowd that gathered before the United States Embassy last night cheered the President to the echo. Dignified business men, women in costly gowns and furs, mingled with sailors, clerks, and the human derelicts that are to be found in every national capital.

Frock-coated, black-cravated gentlemen joined with leather-junged youths in the old "locomotive" yell of college days. The English spectators at first could not understand the phenomenon of several hundred persons, strange to each other, uniting as though rehearsed, in ear-splitting explosions of enthusiasm.

JOIN IN SALVOS.

But soon they caught the swing of the yell, and the shrill treble of the street urchin and rumbling basso of boulevard spectators joined in the rhythmic vocal salvos.

Editorial comment of London newspapers to-day was not only enthusiastic in the highest degree of President Wilson's action in breaking with Germany, but charitable over his previous restraint under "trying circumstances."

TYPICAL COMMENT.

The comment of the Sunday Times—not the Times owned by Lord Northcliffe, but another newspaper—was typical. "The President," it said, "strove with all his power and resources to steer the country clear of war's maelstrom, but the official head of a great and proud people could not expect to stomach such deliberate, wanton insult as Germany's latest note. Its terms were in effect an ultimatum, and America so recognizes it."

"America, unhesitating, is accepting the challenge to the whole world," declared the People. "Its acceptance is tantamount to a declaration of war."

A number of London newspapers published pictures of President Wilson with the caption, "The man of the hour." Their laudation of his course was fulsome.

The News of the World declared: "The Kaiser goaded a great republic into hostility. Lincoln's land will answer with the sword."

A great number of articles of like import have been appearing from day to day in the American press. I can not foretell what eventualities may result from the regrettable international entanglements in which we are now involved. Plainly we are facing a situation in which unhappily our diplomatic relations are sorely strained with respect to some of the belligerent European nations, but I desire to impress my conviction and to express the hope that we will not lose our equilibrium and be swept off our feet, at least at the instance of any foreign power or under the influence of a foreign propaganda put forth for the purpose of exciting us into war. In a matter of this grave import I resent and repel any attempted foreign dictation, no matter from what source it emanates or in what form it comes. We should take our own course in our own way, insisting that foreign powers and foreign or semiforeign peoples attend to their own business. At the same time I venture to express the hope that the officials and people of the United States will avoid any speech of a partisan character calculated to excite passion in our own country.

I have presented this resolution because I think we should let the world know that we support the President of the United States whenever, acting within his constitutional power, he speaks authoritatively for the country. There are Senators who thought it would have been the better part of wisdom if the President had postponed the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany at least until Germany had committed some overt act offensive to this Government and sufficiently aggravated to warrant a step so grave in possible consequences; but the President took a different view, which with great ability he strongly supported in his address before the joint session on the 3d instant, and as, according to my view, he acted within his constitutional authority, I think it both wise and advisable for the Senate to say officially that it accepts and approves this action of the Nation's Chief Magistrate.

The Constitution provides that the President "shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers." The Constitution says nothing about the dismissal of ambassadors and ministers, although Presidents have frequently dismissed such officials on their own initiative. I think the President has this authority, because to him is committed the primary duty and power of conducting our diplomatic affairs, and the constitutional authority to "receive" ambassadors and ministers probably carries with it, as a corollary, the power to dismiss. Nevertheless, it has been said by some whose opinions demand respect, among them at least two Presidents of the United States, that it was the part of wisdom for the President to take the official advice of the Congress before even receiving ministers in circumstances

that might be offensive to another and friendly Government, particularly in cases where a part of the people of such a Government had revolted and set up an independent government of their own. It has been said that in such circumstances it might be provocative of war for this Government to recognize a revolutionary government by receiving a minister therefrom, and so it was thought that as such action on the part of the Chief Executive in its final analysis concerned the "war-making power," it would be advisable for the Executive to consult the Congress in advance. This was the view of President Jackson with reference to the acceptance of a minister from Texas, but manifestly it was not the view of President Roosevelt in the case of Panama. E converso it has been argued that in view of the fact that the peremptory dismissal by the President of a foreign diplomatic representative to this country might lead to the most serious consequences, the President might wisely lay the whole matter before the Congress in advance for its official advice.

However, whatever may be said pro or con in this behalf, it is more a question of policy than of law. I hold that the President is primarily charged with the conduct of our diplomatic relations with foreign powers, and, unless the circumstances should be extremely exceptional, I feel constrained to support and approve the act of a President in dismissing a foreign ambassador or minister, or even in terminating diplomatic relations and putting an end to the ordinary means of international intercourse. As a matter of fact that is practically the identical situation in which we find ourselves with respect to the Republic of Mexico, and that situation has been at least acquiesced in by the Congress for three or four years. In the instance now before us the President has resolutely discharged his duty as he sees it, acting within his authority, and for one I feel that we should let the country know and the world know that we support his action in this behalf.

The mere severance of diplomatic intercourse, while it results in strained relations of acute form, is held to be not an act of war. If it were an act of war the President's right to take such action on his own initiative and without the concurrence of the Congress might indeed be regarded as questionable. The President understands this, and substantially so stated in his address. He recognizes that the Congress only has constitutional power to declare war or inaugurate hostilities against a foreign nation, and accordingly he said that if unhappily it should come to pass that he should believe it necessary to proceed in a more drastic way, he would present the situation to the Congress and ask legislative authority to take such action as the Congress might deem advisable in the premises. That would undoubtedly be the proper constitutional course. If the President should find it necessary, in his own judgment, to again present this matter to the Congress for legislative action, or if the Congress as the war-making power should on their own initiative proceed to the consideration of the questions involved, it would then be the duty of the Congress to proceed upon their own initiative and upon their own responsibility. Whenever it becomes necessary for the Congress to act in this form and manner we will then have reached a point where the President must wait upon the action of the law-making department, unless perchance some emergency should arise making immediate action necessary to resist invasion. It is now only proposed to approve the action of the President with respect to a matter within his constitutional province. If, later, the Congress is called upon to act, then we must discharge our duty from our own viewpoint and upon our own responsibility.

I join the President in his expression of the hope that no adequate occasion will arise to make it necessary, even in his judgment, to again present this subject to the law-making power of the Government. I shall move, Mr. President, that the Senate agree to the resolution without reference to the committee.

Mr. President, I intended before taking my seat, and with the view of refreshing the memory of Senators, to lay before the Senate some authorities respecting (1) the declaration and commencement of war, (2) respecting diplomatic relations between independent states, (3) respecting blockades instituted by one belligerent power against another, (4) and possibly respecting one or two other cognate questions of special pertinence in this juncture of our affairs.

However, Mr. President, being averse to the unnecessary consumption of time in reading these various authorities, some of which are now lying on my desk, I believe I will ask unanimous consent of the Senate to print these excerpts from well-recognized authorities touching the several subjects indicated, in the form of a Senate document. It will not necessitate, I am sure, the publication of a pamphlet exceeding 10 or 12 pages. I think such a pamphlet would be useful to Senators at this time in view of possible eventualities. I therefore ask unanimous consent to print the matter referred to in the form stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. STONE. Then, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this resolution gives the approval of the Senate to the action taken by the President as set forth in his address delivered before the joint session of Congress. That action consisted of the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany. The President then announced that he had handed to the German ambassador his passports and had recalled our ambassador from Berlin.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the President of the United States in taking that action did what was demanded by the honor, the safety, and the future security of the United States. But my personal opinion as to his action is of no consequence at this juncture. The Constitution of the United States has vested the President with the conduct of our foreign relations up to the point when war is the next step. Of his right under the Constitution to dismiss a foreign representative I have no question. The power which can alone receive must, in the necessity of things, be the power which must dismiss. In the exercise of his constitutional power, and with the high responsibility of his office resting upon him, the President has taken this action. It has placed us in controversy and created a strained situation with a foreign nation.

Under these circumstances, so far as I am concerned, party lines vanish, and any criticism of the past or any criticism of the present is silenced for me. When my country is in controversy with a foreign nation I can see for myself but one duty, and that is to stand by and to support the recognized constitutional authority of the Government in our dealings with foreign nations.

I see no place here at this moment for the discussion of an embargo on munitions of war. I think the President was quite right in refusing to impose such an embargo if he desired to preserve neutrality. It seems to me also quite out of place to attempt to apportion blame or praise among other nations. This is not the time nor the place for the expression of sympathies for one side or the other in this great war. There is only one question before us, and that is our relations with one of the great powers of the earth at this moment.

The President has taken grave action. I feel it to be my duty, as I have said, to support him to the utmost of my power. He is the President of my country, the President of the United States. And, Mr. President, if, as we all pray, further difficulties are to be avoided and we are to be saved from war, in my poor judgment there is one step more important than any other, if we are to preserve our peace under existing conditions, and that is to show to the people of the country that we are without divisions at this moment; that we are thinking only of the United States and its representative in all international questions. If we exhibit divisions we exhibit weakness, and weakness is the temptation to those intolerable aggressions which would surely bring the war that we all seek honorably to avoid.

My earnest hope is that at this time personal feelings, political feelings, political enmities will all be laid aside, that we may remember only that we are citizens of a common country, that we are all Americans, and that our first duty is to stand together in this controversy, which has unhappily arisen with another nation, and let that nation and the world know that when the President speaks, as he has spoken, he has the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States, no matter what their race or origin, behind him in the one simple character of American citizens.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I hesitate very much about intruding myself into the discussion, and yet I feel my responsibility as a Senator and think I will be better satisfied, at least, if I say what is in my heart to say.

We are asked to support a resolution offered by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. His appeal is not addressed to Senators upon one side of the Chamber or upon the other, but to Senators upon both sides. We are face to face, in my opinion, with a very delicate and trying situation. If there was any error in the course which has been pursued—and I do not assert that there was—it is now too late to rectify it.

Our diplomatic relations with Germany have been severed by Executive order, and international confusion and dismay have superseded the calm, dispassionate, and sympathetic attitude of the American people toward those engaged in an awful struggle for existence. Whether this situation could have been avoided or not, it is now useless to discuss. The President has committed the country, at least to this extent; and, no matter how Senators may have differed with him regarding the wisdom or

necessity for the step, it has been taken, and it would be a national humiliation now to repudiate his course.

However, Mr. President, he can go no further. The next step, if it should be taken, must be taken by the Congress, to whom the people have confided their destiny by strict constitutional decree. The responsibility for war rests solely with Congress as the guardian and spokesman of the American people. Let us in this solemn hour take counsel of our conscience, measure the awful cost and sacrifice which hinges upon our act, and take only such course as necessity impels, guided by the spirit of the fathers and influenced only by the best interests of our country.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Imperial Government of Germany would intentionally affront us, and we must be very careful not to aggravate any belligerent State now struggling for existence. We must "play no favorites" in that awful struggle. Our first duty is to America and Americans, and we must face the present situation with calmness and candor, with courage and fidelity. May God grant that our country may be spared the horrors of war without humiliation or the sacrifice of any sacred right. I shall support the President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, a grave responsibility rests upon every Member of this body in the consideration of the delicate question before the Senate. It is a responsibility which can not be avoided, however disagreeable it may be to meet the issue. That the Members of the Senate will rise equal to the demands of the solemn situation the heroic past of our common country bids me hope. The way to meet a grave issue is not to blindly follow the President or anybody else. The responsibilities of the Senate are equal and coordinate with the responsibilities of the Executive. If I could be true to my constituents and have the consent of my own conscience and avoid the responsibility of meeting this question by simply referring it to the President, I should be very happy; but I can not do that. I have a duty to perform which I alone can perform. Nor can any other Senator do it and be true to the obligations of his place. To paraphrase the language of another—

The American people honor the Senator wisely taught
That serveth not another's will;
Whose armor is his honest thought,
And simple truth his utmost skill.

In that spirit I shall try to meet the duties of the moment.

Mr. President, if in the mysterious providence of an All-Wise God war shall occur between the United States and Germany, there will be no division of sentiment or break in the ranks of patriotic Americans in defense of the Nation's flag. I shall do all within my power consistent with honor and national self-respect to avert the calamity of war. I am sure Germany does not desire war with the United States, and I know the people of the United States do not wish war with Germany, unless there is greater provocation for war than has yet been given. But if war must come, there will be no faltering on my part nor on the part of those whom I have the honor to represent in this Chamber in the performance of our duty to the Nation.

This country is the common parent of us all, and it matters not what the cause of the quarrel may be. When war is on we shall ask no question, but rather, inspired by a sense of heroic obligation to our country, present a solid, invincible front to the common enemy. I shall vote to give the President men and money to the last soul and dwindling farthing to be used in the Nation's behalf; but I can not vote for this resolution for the reason that it does not express my sincere and best judgment. I do not believe that the President's course was wise, prudent, justified at this time by the facts and for the best interest of the American people and the peoples of the world.

I do not in any sense condone murder upon the high seas, of which Germany may be guilty; nor do I in any way extenuate Great Britain's insolent, cruel, and persistent violation of international law and her contemptuous disregard of the rights of neutrals upon the high seas. Both of these nations are culpable. Their crimes differ only in degree. The motives behind their every act are identical. Cruel selfishness that would crucify truth and immolate justice to promote a personal end is the impelling purpose. Nor would I be understood as questioning the correctness of the President's interpretation of the cold, technical letter of international law. He is, in all probability, correct in his statement as to what the law is to-day, but—

New conditions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth.

And I think that the time is at hand and the circumstances demand that America, occupying a position of such commanding advantage, should write a little international law—law with heart and soul in it, adaptable to the new conditions, placing the rights of man and the human element above the increment of commerce. Such a law would vastly promote the

welfare of humanity throughout the world and better protect the interests of the American people.

I admit that American citizens have the technical right under international law to enter the danger zone. It will not, on the other hand, be denied that their forbearance to exercise that right or privilege at this particular time would redound gloriously to the peace and permanent prosperity of the world. I submit that it would be the highest evidence of perfect neutrality if the United States Government should see to it that our citizens forbear the exercise of such a right. For our country to be drawn into this vortex of blood and plunder to satisfy the greed and cupidity of those who would coin the blood of the murdered soldier and the tears of the broken-hearted women into dollars or perhaps to gratify the desire and vanity of a few daring spirits bent upon a bold and venturesome enterprise would be a calamity, aye, more, a blunder on the part of this administration, the cruel consequences of which the present as well as countless generations yet unborn must sorely suffer.

I trust that God's loving providence may save our common country from further implication in this world disaster, this inexcusable, horrible, and heartless slaughter of human beings; but I am afraid that only through Divine intervention is there basis for such a hope. The men of Europe are mad, the brain reels with a suffusion of hot blood, and the passions of hate poison the heart. They are, as wild beasts following the instinct of self-preservation, fighting for existence. In this state of mind I am afraid that something may be done without intending to offend the American people to justify the President of the United States from his own sense of duty in doing what he has said he would do in the event that Germany persists in her threat to blockade the ports of Great Britain with her submarine fleet. The traffickers in the spoils of war, the sharers of enormous profits of international commerce, have done their pernicious work in the creation of an unhealthy, abnormal, pernicious sentiment in favor of war which seems to have temporarily dethroned the reason of men the world over and poisoned the very current of human love.

God give us pause to contemplate the consequences that will inevitably flow from the things we are about to do. Let prudence, love, fortitude, and truth characterize our deliberation to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have expressed my views upon the general subject of our relations with Germany, and do not desire to extend those remarks; but now, under this resolution, we, as Senators, are asked to connect ourselves with the act already done by the President and to make his responsibility our responsibility.

I am not willing to commit my conscience or my patriotism to the President of the United States or anybody else. I am asked by this resolution, as you are, to take affirmative action upon this question. If you believe the President was right, and you are called upon in the proper way to indorse his action, there is no reason why you should not do so; but by the same token, if I believe the President was wrong, when I am called upon to take affirmative action upon this question I shall be guided by my own conscience and convictions, and not by those of anybody else.

Mr. President, there is no reason why this question should have been brought to the Senate at all. The act of severing relations with Germany was an executive act. The President did not in advance ask the advice of Congress upon that question. There was no reason why he should. It was strictly within his jurisdiction. He took the responsibility, grave as it was, of pursuing the course he has taken. That responsibility should remain with him until we are called upon to take some action that is within our jurisdiction.

Why should we be asked to indorse what has been done by the President? We have no official connection with it. The responsibility does not rest upon us. But, Mr. President, there may come, and that very soon, a time when we will be called upon to follow in the footsteps of the President and take upon ourselves a responsibility of the highest character and the gravest consequences. Until that time comes, the mind of every Member of this body should be kept open and free to discuss and act upon that question uninfluenced by any previous action.

What are we proposing to do to-day by this resolution? We are proposing to indorse the act already done by the President and make it our act. That involves two things. The President has severed our relations with Germany, as he had a right to do if he thought it was his duty; but he has gone further than that and said to the Congress: "If Germany follows the course that is threatened, I shall call upon Congress to give me authority

to use the Army and Navy for the purpose of enforcing American rights." If we indorse the act done by the President in severing relations with Germany, at the same time, by enacting this resolution, we adopt his policy that if Germany pursues the course that is threatened we are ready to declare war upon Germany. That is what it means. It is practically a declaration of war on our part.

Mr. President, it may be that there are Members of this body who are ready now to declare war upon Germany, but I am not. Germany may do some act in the future that would cause you and me, as the representatives of the people of the United States, to take that step; but if the President should do what he says he is going to do under certain circumstances—call upon us to authorize him to use the Army and the Navy—who knows whether that is going to be upon such cause as you and I would regard as sufficient for a declaration of war against Germany?

If the President had severed relations with Germany, and if the Senator from Missouri had allowed the matter to rest there, as I think should have been done, and the Senate had not been called upon to take affirmative action upon it, nobody would have been inclined, I suppose—certainly nobody on this floor—to criticize the President for the action he has taken, however much we might differ from him as to the cause of severing relations with Germany. But now, as I have said, we are asked to take up this matter ourselves, as representatives of the Government, and make his act our act; and I am not ready to go to that extent.

Mr. President, it is all well enough for Senators to say that we should support the President. I am here, representing in part, the people of the United States, not any individual, whether he be President or somebody else; and I hold it to be my right and my duty, when I am called upon to act upon this or any other question, to do what I believe to be right, just as the President has done.

Of course, if we should come to war with Germany that would be quite a different matter. I presume no Senator would be heard to raise his voice against his own country if we should come to that pass. But now we are asked to take steps ourselves that may lead to war with Germany, and so far as I am concerned I am going to take the course that I believe to be right, and I am not going to commit it to the President of the United States.

We must recognize the fact that this is a critical time for the people of this country. If there was ever a time when Members of this body should act strictly upon their honest convictions, certainly this is the time.

Now, I am opposed to this resolution on conviction. I shall vote against it for that reason. It does not matter to me what the convictions of somebody else may be. I can not be guided by considerations of that kind. I am not here to criticize the President for what he has done so far. That was his responsibility. I am quite content to leave it to him. But now it is my responsibility, and I shall take the course to which I am led by my own convictions and oppose and vote against the resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, while I intend to vote for this resolution which the Senator from Missouri has offered, I regret very much that the resolution is before the Senate. If it is desirable that the action of the President in dismissing the representative of the German Imperial Government be approved by this body, then it seems to me it would have been much more appropriate if the action were asked in advance of the dismissal rather than to ask it now.

I know, or at least I believe, with the Senator from Missouri, that the weight of authority is that the President in dismissing the ambassador from Germany and severing diplomatic relations with the Imperial Government was within his province and within the bounds of his authority. I believe that has been, with few exceptions, the custom of the country. My own idea is that that doctrine is wrong. I do not believe that the President ought to sever diplomatic relations with any country with which we are at peace until he has first submitted all the evidence in his possession to the Congress and asked their action on it.

But I can not criticize the President for taking the other course. As I said, the weight of authority is probably with him in that course. So I must assume that he was acting then within his own province, and when he has so acted in an important matter like this I consider it my duty to weigh every doubt in his favor, and unless I have positive evidence to the contrary I would not criticize him, but, if compelled to vote one way or the other, would vote in approval of his action.

But, Mr. President, undoubtedly the President has had before him much evidence that we have never seen. How much weight that has had or ought to have in acting upon the question I

can not say. At least, it seems to me it would be fair to the Congress, if we are called upon to pass our judgment on this question, that all the evidence and all the correspondence be laid before us before we act officially.

When the President, acting within the scope of his jurisdiction and his authority, takes a particular course, I feel it my duty as a citizen of the United States to follow him, but when I am called upon to vote "yea" or "nay" upon approval of an official act, then it seems to me I ought to be given all the light that he had when he acted officially. So while it does not seem to me to be quite fair to ask the Senate to pass upon the resolution in this way, I will vote for it, because I want no division in any matter as important as this.

Mr. President, I do not believe the resolution ought to be here, because our action can add nothing to or detract nothing from what the President has already done. We had a resolution before us not long ago approving the action of the President in sending notes to Germany and the other belligerent powers, or at least approving them in part. It seemed to me that that was out of place, although I voted for the resolution because I want the world to know that in any contest we may have with any of the belligerent nations our country and our people will be united. But if we are to have a resolution of approval of every official act of the President it will not be long until the people will believe, and will be justified in believing, that when he performs some official act and we do not pass a resolution of approval, therefore we do not agree with him.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States says that Congress alone has the power to declare war; but the President has the authority that he has taken in this case; and, as I said, I believe that the weight of authority gives him the right to take steps that will make war inevitable. If that is the right doctrine then the provision of the Constitution which gives to Congress the right to declare war, and the sole right, is of but little value. If the President can sever at his pleasure diplomatic relations with foreign governments, then in the President lies the real power to declare war, because although the Constitution says Congress has the sole right to declare war, the President having diplomatic matters supremely in his own hands can get Congress and the country in a position where they can not avoid war. If we are to give practical effect to the constitutional provision that Congress has the sole power to declare war, then the President ought never sever diplomatic relations with any nation with which we are at peace, or do any other act that in its natural course would have a tendency to bring on war, without first submitting all the papers and all the evidence to Congress, and then act on the judgment rendered by that official body to which is given by the Constitution the sole right to declare war.

I would have been glad if the President had submitted to Congress all the evidence bearing upon the question before he acted. I wish he had laid aside any technical right that he might possess and had taken the broad view that that course was the right course to pursue. The power that has the right under the Constitution to declare war ought to have the power over the steps that lead to war. But the President took the other course, and I admit he has followed distinguished examples and illustrious predecessors in those steps, and I would not criticize him for taking it, but it is his responsibility and not ours when he takes that course. Mr. President, when I vote for this resolution I think if I remained silent I could be properly charged with approving every act that has led up to it. I do not approve of the course that our President has taken in foreign affairs altogether. I think many mistakes have been made; and yet I have always refrained from publicly saying so, because I realize that the President being charged with responsibility is entitled to my support, even though I do not agree with every detail and every step that he has taken. I am willing to give that to him as a citizen and as a Senator both, but I do not believe it is quite fair to ask me to vote officially for the approval of all these acts.

I felt, Mr. President, since the yeas and nays are to be called on this question, that I could not put myself on record here by simply voting one way or the other without an injustice even to myself, and I therefore felt constrained to say this much on the question in order that my action may be understood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I feel that I can not vote on the resolution without a statement in the RECORD as to how far this vote commits my future action. I assume, and if I am not correct I hope the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will correct me—I assume that this resolution has not been introduced into the Senate without consultation with and the approval of the President of the United States.

Mr. STONE. I wish to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. STONE. The resolution was introduced without consultation with the President of the United States, and since its introduction I have not seen or talked with the President, not since the day he delivered his address before the joint session of the two Houses.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator a leading question then, because his answer may very materially determine my attitude in this matter. Did this resolution come merely with the desire of the Senator himself for an expression of opinion, or does the Senator understand that it is introduced with a desire to support the attitude of the President of the United States?

Mr. STONE. The two questions propounded by the Senator from Alabama strike me as being the same in effect. He wishes to know whether I introduced it with a view of expressing my individual opinion or to secure an expression of the opinion of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it may be that I have not made myself clear, and I wish to do so. I desire to know from the Senator whether he has talked with the President or talked with somebody else in authority, and as to whether it is his understanding that the Executive desires this resolution to be passed or not?

Mr. STONE. I have answered that substantially. I said I had had no consultation whatever with the President. I have had no consultation on this subject with any executive official. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not. I wished to find out from the Senator, if I could, as to whether the President of the United States in his opinion feels that the passage of this resolution will uphold his hands in this emergency or not.

Mr. STONE. I do not know what the President thinks or feels. I have had no expression whatever from the President on the subject. I thought, and so stated in my remarks, that it would be an advisable thing for the Senate officially to say that it approves the action of the President, and gave my reasons therefor. That is as frank and as full as I can make it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the President of the United States desired in this emergency action by the Senate of the United States to sustain the course that he has pursued in this matter, for one I would give it unhesitatingly and ungrudgingly and without criticism of any kind. But if it is not the desire of the President of the United States, and if he does not feel that it is necessary to sustain his course, the bringing of this resolution before the Senate, I think is very ill-advised and very ill-timed on the part of the Senator from Missouri. However, I intend to vote for the resolution since it is before the Senate. The Senator from Missouri in his high position should of course uphold the hands of the President of the United States in a grave emergency, but he should know that he is upholding the hands of the President of the United States in his action and be able to tell his colleagues on the floor of the Senate that he is doing so when he asks their support and their action.

Mr. STONE. Since the Senator is personally criticizing—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I mean it as no personal criticism. I am criticizing the action of the Senator.

Mr. STONE. It is not offensive at all, but the Senator says, if he will permit me, that I ought to have acted only in support of the President. The resolution approves the act of the President. If that is not supporting his act, I do not know what it means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is dividing the situation in substance. If it is necessary to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in this hour by the affirmative action of the Senate, we can be assured of that fact. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who would not readily and cheerfully respond. But if it is not necessary at this time, the resolution is proposing a decision about which we ought not to be prepared to express our judgment in this hour and this day. It is too serious a matter. It involves too greatly the life of the Nation, the happiness of the people of the United States, to be forced to an immature and ill-considered judgment.

Mr. President, up to this time I have not allowed myself to become a partisan of either of the contending forces on the battle fields of Europe. I have stood for the peace of my Nation, an honorable peace. So far as the President of the United States is concerned, I approve his course in guiding the ship of state through the many dangers that have beset it in the last three years and maintaining peace for the Nation. No greater glory crowns his administration than the fact that he has been able to keep his people out of war.

I have no criticism of the President of the United States in his action in recalling our ambassador home from Germany. There were two courses open for him to pursue after the receipt of the German note advising this country that that Government intended to pursue a relentless submarine warfare. One was to await a direct violation of our neutrality by an affirmative act. The other was to recall our ambassador as notice to the Imperial Government of Germany that we would not recognize and did not recognize what it proposed to do.

I can not question and I do not believe there is a citizen of this Republic who can question in this hour the earnest efforts of the President of the United States to maintain peace. His position on that question is above criticism from the standpoint of the man who wishes that peace may be kept. So I do not think it lies within the mouth of any man to say that the President of the United States has taken this action with an intention that it may lead to war.

I feel, and I believe every citizen of the Republic feels, that the action was taken by the President with the hope that he may ultimately maintain the peace. It was a dangerous position to take, but possibly the correct position. It was not for us to determine. In matters of this kind we have but one chief. He must decide for the Nation. I am glad to feel that that decision will not fall on the side of war if it can be avoided. But when it comes to war, that is not within the province of the President of the United States. The responsibility will not rest with him. It will rest under the Dome of this Capitol.

Whatever opinion he has in reference to the situation undoubtedly will have great weight and receive great consideration when the time comes. But so far as I am concerned, representing in part the people of one of the Commonwealths of this country, bearing responsibility myself and with no desire to avoid or shirk it, I do not wish when I cast my vote for this resolution that has been forced upon us to-day to do so with any limitations on my action as a Senator and my right to express freely with my own judgment what should be done in the interest of my own people and the people of this country in the event that war or threatened war comes knocking at our door.

I say this that the Record may show it. I say this that my own people may know that in this day and hour I am not foreclosing their rights or my judgment in reference to their rights to maintain peace if possible, but on the other hand, although I think this resolution is ill-advised at this time, the President of the United States is a man of sound judgment, a man of great force of character, a man with undoubted courage, therefore I will uphold his hands. He has taken his responsibility before the nations of the world, and I have no doubt he is willing to stand as the Chief Executive of this Nation to speak for the people of the United States without a sustaining voice for what he thinks is right. I can not conceive that the Chief Executive of this land for one moment would ask or expect to foreclose the future judgment of the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, I say in my judgment this resolution at this time is ill-advised. It is before the Senate. It must be disposed of. It must be voted for or against. It is not the effect on our own people that is material. The adverse of the resolution by the Senate of the United States might be misinterpreted in foreign lands. It might be given the misinterpretation that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States were not ready and willing to sustain to the last dollar and the last man the Chief Executive of the Nation in time of peril. It is because I fear a misinterpretation might be made of the adverse of the resolution in foreign countries that I shall cast my vote for the resolution when the roll is called.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, in this fateful hour I wish to say a few words. I think if this were but a question of whether or not the President has the power to sever diplomatic relations with Germany all of us would concede it. Since there is no question of power, I think it is singularly unfortunate that this resolution has been placed before the Senate at this time.

As to my sympathies, it is unnecessary to state whether they are with England, who has been the proud mistress of the seas, and her allies or with imperial Germany. I think it was along in the commencement of this war that my own mind was made up as to what nation was in the wrong. My own sympathies, of course, are with one or the other side, and I should not hesitate to declare them here if I regarded it necessary; but it seems to me that the purpose of this resolution or its effect, if not its purpose, will be to declare in a preliminary way that the United States shall go to war. Feeling as I do about it in that way, I shall not hesitate to vote against the resolution.

It has been said that the President of the United States has not asked and has not desired that this question shall be brought into this assembly here. I do not know what the facts may be. He does not doubt his own power to accomplish the result that

he has already declared. We concede it. The American Nation has not complained, neither has the Senate; but I want to say here to-day that I raise my voice in protest, not for the allies and not for imperial Germany, but for the United States of America. I do not believe the time has come when we should make a preliminary declaration of war which the adoption of this resolution commits us to. For that reason I am going to vote against the resolution.

The resolution says that the President has declared what his course shall be—to ask Congress for authority to use the power of the Nation to prevent—if Germany shall pursue the policy which it has declared it must. Germany says "England has blockaded our ports; our people are starving; our back is to the wall; and the time has come when we will unleash the tigers of the undersea and send menace and horror and blight and death through all the prohibited zone, blockading her ports yonder because we have the power to do it and must fight with the means at our command. Necessity requires it shall be done." That is the position of Germany. The President has said, "If Germany shall do that, I am going to come to you again, gentlemen of the Congress, and I am going to ask the power to use all the authority and all the power of the United States of America to prevent that condition."

Mr. President, I regard it as a preliminary declaration of war if the resolution shall be voted upon favorably to-day. Therefore, I shall not vote for it. I do not believe the time has come in the history of this country when we shall side with Germany or when we shall side with the allies. I do not believe if Germany ought to be thrashed in this great war—and I am not saying that she should not be—that it is the province or business of the United States to do the thrashing. The time has not come, in my opinion, when it should be done, and we should commit ourselves by the adoption of this resolution to any policy that the President may hereafter pursue. Under the Constitution and the law he has no power to declare war, but he has in fact the power to plunge the Nation into war and to make it necessary for Congress to declare it; and he has almost done so.

Now, gentlemen, I feel this way about it. I think this is the most momentous occasion that will probably ever come to me in my service in the Senate, and I shall raise my voice for America and for peace, and I shall not vote for this resolution, which is to commit us to granting the power to enforce by war our own views of what international law is by the power of the United States. I will not do it.

If war shall come, if we shall declare war—and I shall vote against that also—but I say after war has come, let the majority in this country rule. I say let the last man in this country of ours be sent and the last dollar be given freely to uphold the declaration of war by this country whether it be right or wrong.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, war, war! God knows I hate the very word! To my mind's eye comes a picture of horrors too shocking to contemplate. I harbor no hate for Germany nor to any other nation, but America has rights, and I feel it is our duty to maintain them.

Mr. President, my father came from sunny France, and my dear, good mother, from whose bosom I drank the milk of justice and liberty, came from Germany, from the Rhine. So why should I harbor hate toward either of these contestants?

No; God knows I have no hate for either, though I was born in America. I am an American in every fiber of my body and soul. I may disagree with policies, but first and last I am with my country. I am willing to trust the President in this crisis. We must be united in a crucial time like this. May God keep our blessed land out of war is my prayer and my plea.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I believe that the sentiment of the people of this country is known to every Senator here, and I do not think there is any reason why we should disguise that knowledge either from ourselves or from the country. If there is another *Lusitania* incident this country will go to war. If this country is forced into war, in my humble opinion it will be largely by reason of the misdirected efforts of some of those who assume to themselves all of the burdens of peace.

There was only one course for the President to pursue under all of the prior declarations and under the sentiment of the people of this country, and that was to say that the character of the warfare that brought on the *Lusitania* incident will not be tolerated again by this country. Other announcements have heretofore been made to the warring powers with regard to the intentions of this country, but those declarations to those belligerent powers have been minimized, if not destroyed, by pacifist speeches which we have heard on the floor of this body similar to those we have heard to-day. There have been other occasions when the press of Germany unequivocally stated that the people of the United States did not back up the President

of the United States. To-day there is a resolution pending before this body, and whether it be here properly or not has nothing to do with the question. The action of this body will be construed by Germany either rightfully or wrongfully. I hope that the action of the United States will be rightfully construed by Germany, because I pray God that Germany, with whom alone to-day is the power of peace or war, will decide that there shall be peace. It is with Germany alone to determine whether or not our citizens shall be illegally and wilfully murdered upon the high seas. If that is done again, again I say that nothing, not even all of the eloquence of these gentlemen here, not all of the propaganda that may be started throughout this country, will prevent the American people from demanding reparation for such crimes.

We all want peace. I think it is presumptuous for some Members of this body to assume that they alone want peace, while those that pursue a different practice to obtain peace want nothing but murder and war. The peace sentiment of this country is known. I want to say here that, in my humble opinion, peace can never be obtained through a lack of self-respect or through acts that destroy the respect of the world for the people of this country.

National honor, to my mind, means nothing but self-respect and the respect of other nations. The criticism has been made, and not without justification, that the citizens of the United States in foreign countries are less respected than the people of any other great nation. I do not know whether or not that is so, but it has been the cause of comment from time to time. We are a Nation, and as a Nation our duty to our citizens is not within our borders alone, but it is our duty to protect our citizens in every country throughout the world. It is the duty of this Nation to protect the citizen's life, his liberty, and his property according to the laws of the country, wherever he may be.

How can you protect them? You can only protect them through the respect that the nation where that citizen resides has for this Nation. Thus it has been that Great Britain and Germany and France and Russia and Italy and other countries have protected the rights of their citizens in other countries; and thus alone can America protect the rights of its citizens in foreign countries.

It is not this one right upon the high seas that we are demanding; it is not the right to ship our commerce upon the high seas; it is not the right of our seamen to work where they please upon the high seas; but it is the right of an American citizen to be protected in his rights wherever he may be. I believe that that which more endangers our country from war than anything else is the constant declaration to the world that no matter what they may do to our citizens; no matter how illegal their acts may be; no matter how barbarous they may be, we will not resent them if in that resentment it becomes necessary to engage in war. Those declarations, whether made here or in the press or anywhere else, in my humble opinion, are going to bring war to this country, if war comes at all.

I believe that if we had backed up unequivocally, and without the show of fear of war that we have shown here, the position taken by the President of the United States, the practices which are threatened would never be put into effect. They have not yet actually been put into effect, although the order has been in force for several days. I do not believe they ever would be put into force and effect if those who are contemplating doing so were told unequivocally that their loss by reason of such an act would be far greater than any possible gain that they could obtain by it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, during the interval between the outbreak of the war in Europe and the present time I have endeavored to keep aloof from those excitements and apprehensions which were the natural outgrowth of that awful struggle. I have during that time been in disagreement with those who have felt that because of this war, a vast and extensive preparedness was essential to our immediate or future safety. I have protested upon this floor on more than one occasion against that hysteria which was first created, and then capitalized for the transformation of this country into what seemed to me to be a permanent system of militarism. I have not permitted myself to entertain the view that any great nation could swiftly invade us or that an army approaching that of Germany or a navy approaching that of Great Britain was necessary for our protection. I have endeavored, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and a Member of this body, to proceed along the line of preparedness as though no great conflict existed. I was unable, therefore, to give my assent to either of the great war bills of the last session, because I felt that they carried this country to an extremity and committed it to a policy which no occasion warranted and in-

creased the burden of our permanent expenditures to an undue proportion. No man therefore can accuse me, Mr. President, of being imbued with a warlike spirit or with harboring a desire to do ought that would magnify the solemnity of the existing condition when I announce my adhesion to the purpose of this resolution and my approval of its introduction.

Mr. President, since the first note sent by the President to Germany after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and based upon that frightful tragedy, I read and reflected upon its recitals and requirements, I have felt that our future relations with Germany would be largely, if not entirely, controlled and dictated by its own policies and purposes. I thought, upon mature deliberation, that what the administration then did and then said was abundantly justified by the occasion which provoked its utterance. I was persuaded that it could have done no less, and that had it even faltered in that declaration which it sent across the seas, it would not have fully represented our traditions, our principles, or our existing opinion, and would not have measured up to the crisis which then confronted it.

The President was then and afterwards accused by his critics of vacillation, of weakness, of a willingness to sacrifice our highest traditions and to imperil our national integrity as the price of preserving peace. Some of his friends quietly criticized his judgment, while expressing and entertaining the highest opinion of his patriotism and earnestness of purpose. But I have been unable to discern between the first *Lusitania* note and the progress of American diplomacy and the severance of our diplomatic relations with Germany any deviation of the President from the course then announced, from the notification then given, from the policy then determined upon.

He appeared before the Congress last May because of other events in conflict with that policy, for which Germany was responsible, and informed us of the ultimatum which he had delivered to that country in strict compliance with his first notification. I approved of his course then, and would willingly have so said in public response to a resolution like that which we are now considering.

The notification of Germany on the 30th day of January terminating its former assurance to the President and announcing its intention to take advantage of the reservation attached to it instantly aroused in every thinking man and woman in the United States the conviction that the President would take, that the President must take, that the President would be recreant to himself, to his party, and to his country if he did not take, the identical course with Germany which he announced last week to the Congress. But I think, Mr. President, whether we commend or condemn that course, whether we approve or disapprove the action there taken, when we also reflect that upon him is imposed the supreme responsibility of action, that upon his judgment, his wisdom, his ideals, his devotion to duty rested the final determination, our judgment as American citizens was foreclosed when the final step was taken. We may not have approved it; we may not have justified it; aye, we may have deplored it; but the constitutional authority of the United States acted at a critical moment on a great occasion upon a matter of tremendous consequence to him, to us, and to our posterity, upon which he was required by the responsibilities of his great position to act, and upon which none other could act, we, as the people of the United States, we, as the citizens of the greatest neutral nation, have but one course to take, but one duty to perform, if we are Americans. We shall stand by the administration as our fathers before us have ever stood when facing another nation with which a rupture seems imminent.

It may lead us into the desolation of war and conflict, which God forbid; it may broaden the horizon of the mighty conflict now waging upon other continents, and our shores and our land may be red with the blood of our sons shed in the defense of their country; but, Mr. President, we have reached the point where reflection and argument is at an end, where the die has been cast, where duty now speaks, and where every impulse of patriotism and integrity calls upon us to stand by the President, forgetting party lines and past differences, our eyes fixed upon the future, the hope still in our bosoms that peace may yet prevail, but our resolution, our steadfast purpose, admitting of neither doubt nor hesitation. To falter now is impossible. To hesitate may be to be lost. But to be disunited in so supreme a crisis is to encourage, if not to court, the disaster we would shun.

Such, Mr. President, I believe to be the sentiment of the Commonwealth which I in part represent upon this floor; such has been the voice of the legislature of my State; such the assurance of its governor, with no partisanship in the expression of either branch of the government and no hesitation. There the ranks which were divided are closed; there men and women stand shoulder to shoulder; they know but one duty; they see

but one goal; their gaze is upon the President; their destiny, the destiny of a common country.

And so, Mr. President, I have felt it my duty on this occasion to take a few moments of time to announce my adhesion—my full, undivided adhesion—to the position taken by the President, and to voice what I know to be the sentiment of the people of the State of Colorado upon this solemn occasion.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, to hesitate now is to invite aggression. While Congress is vested under the organic act with power to declare war, the maintenance or severance of diplomatic relations rests with the Chief Magistrate of the Republic. He has exercised that power; he has presented through a proper message to Congress his reasons for the exercise of that power at the time and in the circumstances named. The severance of the usual diplomatic relations verges dangerously near hostilities. That is universally understood.

This resolution proposes to do no more than to approve the reasons and generally accepted principles contained in the President's last message. The passage of this resolution does not commit us to war, unless the acts mentioned in the President's message shall have been perpetrated. The performance of the inhibited acts rests with another sovereignty. Those conditions we ultimately must meet, unless the declared purpose of the German Government shall be abandoned. On the passage or defeat of this resolution depends the view entertained by the German Imperial Government of the unity of the American people or the lack of it.

We speak of the public sentiment, Mr. President, and of the American people. It is time that the American people awoke to world conditions. If the powers assumed to be exercised under the guise of a blockade shall be carried into effect, there is an end to all neutral trade, ours alike with others. If the enlarged war zone mentioned in Germany's last note shall be made effective and shall be a precedent, then the neutral nations of the world had as well furl the sails of their merchant fleets, close their warehouses, and let their commerce rot on their piers, or by their united act establish the universal rights of market for every neutral nation in the world. If the war zone mentioned can be declared in the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent embraced waters, it can as well be extended halfway across the Atlantic, or within the 3-mile limit of the shores of this Republic. If it can be declared and established in one ocean, it can be declared and established on the blue waters of the seven seas of the earth.

I am reluctant, Mr. President, to take the step; but to hesitate now ultimately would be the signal to the world of national cowardice. In the final analysis of the passage or defeat of this resolution will be gauged the public sentiment of the American people. For one, I am willing to register my vote for this resolution, and to approve the message of the President to which it refers.

If the law of blockade as proposed, and the proposed application of the submarines to enforce it, shall be the law of nations, then Germany's war zone may circle the globe. There is no limitation save the marginal waters that bound the different shores of the nations of the earth. How long will even they be secure against international lawlessness and the limitless law of force?

Mr. President, I believe I have been consistent on this question. I know I have from my lights, from the viewpoint I have taken. I voted, so far as it could be voted upon in this body, to warn American citizens to refrain from traveling upon the armed merchant ships of belligerent nations. Practically for the purpose of destroying submarines, every belligerent merchant ship that has left our ports since war was declared has been a naval auxiliary—not for general naval purposes, but their armament was of the character that would sink a submarine with its frail armored sides exposed to a shot carried by the average gun on a merchant ship. I so voted in order that we might seasonably avoid the difficulties which we now find ourselves approaching. I so voted because I considered the merchant ship of a belligerent nation so armed, with the uses to which submarines are now put, to be a fighting ship.

The open sea is a place where every fighting ship of a belligerent nation may lawfully engage an enemy in battle. If I were voluntarily to thrust myself between the contending lines of enemy nations in military operations on land, I would consider that I took my chances of destruction. I believed I would have no right to call upon my Government to protect me in such circumstances. I considered that if I traveled upon the merchant ship of a belligerent nation armed for defensive purposes sufficiently to destroy a submarine I voluntarily put myself on the high seas at a point of danger wherever a naval battle occurred, and that the Government therefore owed me no duty of protection. Having held that view, Mr. President, I voted to warn

American citizens from taking passage on the merchant ships of belligerent nations.

That, however, presented an entirely different question. In a previous communication before the issues presented by the last communication from the German Government it is true, as the Senator from California [Mr. Works] said to-day, that she impliedly reserved the right, if the allies continued to violate the law of nations as to merchant shipping, to pursue unlimited warfare by submarines.

Mr. President, the allies have not destroyed life in the prosecution of their blockade. England, I think unlawfully, has interfered with our neutral commerce. She has unlawfully taken cargoes of merchandise bound from our neutral ports to a neutral destination, impounded them in her prize courts, condemned them by decrees under her admiralty laws, confiscated and sold them, or appropriated them to her purposes. That, however, concerns merchandise. It is capable of reparation in damages, either now or in the future arbitration of the world. That concerns something which may be compensated for. I discriminate between the confiscation of insensate merchandise, whose lifeblood is gold, and the murder of women and children, whose defenseless lives can never be redeemed by the German Government and no adequate reparation ever be made.

It is threatened, Mr. President, in the event that the allies continue their breaches of international law in mere matters of merchandise and the cargoes of our ships to renew an indiscriminate and ruthless warfare within the prescribed zone which takes in, admittedly, the high seas of the world. Not since the days of the corsairs, the days when the pirates, unexposed, sailed the seas and undertook to confiscate at pleasure the merchandise and the lives of every nation, has there been a more unjustifiable proclamation to the nations of the world than the late one extending the war zone into the Atlantic Ocean and other bodies of navigable tidewater named in the German Government's last decree.

That is the question we are meeting. At last, Mr. President, our Chief Magistrate rose to the high level of the great emergencies of the hour and correctly stated in his message to Congress, after using exemplary patience, the supreme issues that face our people.

Mr. President, I do not desire to consume time needlessly. What I shall have to say will be condensed within the smallest possible compass. It is not the time for words. I decry war as much as those Senators who may oppose this resolution, but there are sacrifices of peace, there are prices paid to avoid war that are greater than the priceless atonements of war. There are more precious possessions in this world than mere life. At least, if American life shall be offered on the altar of a world's peace the strong will die that our weak and defenseless may live in the years to come. The preservation of life at the price of dishonor would stamp us as an unworthy posterity of the ancestors who gave us the splendid gifts of American citizenship and our heritage of liberty. Our ancestors fought in every battle of this Republic, from Monmouth to Appomattox, from Chapultepec to Santiago, and if we to-day upon the active stage of human affairs can not hold ourselves ready and willing to make the sacrifice our fathers made, then let us abdicate the high privilege of American citizenship and proclaim to the world the implied cowardice employed in the defeat of such a resolution as this.

I am no apologist for what I consider the domestic mistakes of this administration. From many of them—most of them—I totally dissent. But this resolution approaches the territory where partisan differences cease, where mere party dies, where the clamor of the politician must end, where discord is stilled, and where the rights of the American Nation must begin.

Mr. President, our conduct, our willingness now to approve the only honorable course that the Chief Magistrate could take, means, more than likely, the avoidance of the very difficulties we deprecate. An adverse vote on this resolution will give encouragement to those who have proclaimed their intention to destroy the rights of neutral commerce, including our own, in a zone that is totally unjustified by the laws of war.

On the 19th of April, 1861, President Lincoln issued a proclamation blockading the ports and waters of the Confederate States of America. It did not seek to go beyond the marginal waters of this Republic. It did not invade tidewater beyond our territorial waters and proclaim a zone in the ocean from which the commerce of neutrals was barred. Its very terms restricted it to a blockade of the ports of the rebellious States. It did not seek to exclude neutrals from the arms of the ocean and the great sounds that are the inlets of the maritime traffic of the world; neither did it seek to invade the channels and the highways of the ocean and interfere with the neutral commerce that legitimately traveled there. The blockade was more

or less effective, but it was confined to the ports of the rebellious States.

This blockade, under the decree of the German Government, roughly speaking, as I estimate, extends approximately between 300 and 400 miles from the Irish coast. It comprises practically all of the North Sea; it comprises the English Channel, all the tidewaters adjacent to the northern coast of Spain, and denies ingress or egress to those going and coming from the Mediterranean Sea. By the same process, by the same logic of principle, the Imperial Government of Germany could blockade the water almost or quite from a point within gunshot of our coast, from Hell Gate to the Pillars of Hercules and from the Arctic Circle on our north to Cape Horn, marking the uttermost bounds of land in the Western Hemisphere, and still be within the admitted principles laid down in her last communication upon that subject.

What does it mean? It means that neutral trade is no more. It is more effective than an embargo laid by Congress, because when once in effect it destroys our commerce not only by confiscation of the cargo but by the sinking of the vessel. What does this note mean further? It means, Mr. President, a ruthless warfare, with no visit and search, with no saving of the life of passengers and crew, but returns to the ancient piratical method of destroying, without a chance of surrender, all on board.

What are the laws of war, both on land and at sea? They have been violated many times in this great war. Francis Lieber, an adopted citizen of our country, a German by birth, wrote the most humane code of civilized warfare known to the powers of the world. He fought at Waterloo, and carried with him to his American grave the marks of bullets received on that fatal day when the sun of Napoleon set on his dream of empire. Lieber wrote a code of war that is instinct with the humanities of a great cause. In it prisoners of war are recognized and their rights and lives are to be preserved. He wrote, it is true, for land; but from the time of Hugo Grotius the same humane rule has prevailed on sea as on land. An enemy can take his choice. He can fight under his flag and die, or he can strike his colors, surrender, and live. It is the universal right of the vanquished enemy to surrender and save his life, and the equally universal duty of the conqueror to spare his life upon that surrender, and to give him the opportunity to surrender.

The use of the submarine, especially that threatened in the last note, gives none of those humane rights. It is a declaration that no vessel, belligerent or neutral, will be spared; that no life, combatant or noncombatant, will be spared; that men, women, and children will be joined in an indiscriminate slaughter. To the horrors of war, sufficiently brutal at its very best, will be added the destruction that comes from the mingling in a common grave and in a common river of blood of those who, by the laws even of savage empires in the days of old, have been spared, when the women and children were collected and protected in camps. Even Attila the Hun, the scourge of God, when he came from the confines of central Asia and upon the night of the fatal day when he met his defeat at the hands of Christendom, piled high his spoil and arranged his war chariots for final defense in the morning, made provision for the care and safety of the men and women who were noncombatants and the helpless that might be involved with him in a common defeat.

The same territory over which surges to-day the tide of war, the scene of the battle of Chalons-sur-Marne and all along the eastern and northern front of France, is a historic field where the armed legions of the great martial leaders of the centuries have met in mortal combat. They fought, even those denominated by the sacred historians as pagans, with some regard for the rights of the helpless, the sick, the weak, the women, and the children. To-day we face the common tribunal of mankind. We meet the solemn occasion, and must assume the duty, once for all, of declaring in this Chamber whether we approve or condemn the ruthless warfare of the submarine. What shall our verdict be? Not by our generation, but by the centuries yet to come, shall we be judged.

I shall go on record against it, Mr. President. This is the first opportune occasion I have had. I have had my own views. I have my sympathies. Who has not? I have sedulously restrained them, and have voted at times contrary to my own private opinions on the merits of certain issues in order that we might hold ourselves aloof from this mighty struggle across the sea. I can hold myself aloof no longer. It is not a matter of ancestry. I do not know, as many of us in our country, especially those of the far West, do not know, from whom we came, of what ancestry in the Old World. It is enough for me to know that to-day I am an American citizen. What blood of Europe once pulsed in our veins is not now significant. To-day

it is American. It is enough for me to know that upon the solemn issue presented to the Senate by this resolution, as the initial point at the threshold of our official action I shall vote to condemn in unqualified terms the use of the submarine as an instrumentality, used in the way it has been and is threatened to be used, totally inconsistent with the laws and practices of civilized nations.

Mr. President, it is said that we will need, some time, the submarine. It may be; but it will be in defense of our shores, of our ports, of our cities. At no time will we wage aggressive war. At no time in the future, I believe, by our traditions and our declared purposes of the present hour, will we seek an enemy across the sea and add to that the lust of territorial conquest to spread the borders of this Republic beyond the seas. If I had had my way about it, I never would have voted nor would I have shotted a single gun to take the Philippine Islands. It is a mere matter of duty now to hold them and administer them for the people, so that they may not be turned loose upon the world, a blazing derelict of nations and the scene of a mighty disorder. But for us there is no aggressive warfare, no spoils, no victims nor prisoners whose ransom shall the general coffers fill, nor kings to lead at the chariot wheels of the conqueror for us in the lifetime of our Republic. For us alone is reserved the development of the country given us by the beneficence of our ancestors and by the merciful dispensations of Providence to develop it, to hold it secure; so our future wars will be defensive wars. I have no fear of any limitations placed upon the submarine that may hamper us in the future defensive war or wars, whenever they may come.

I wrote not long ago, Mr. President, letters to several of my constituents on this question. I knew that ultimately it must be met. I believe it wise when trouble of this character is coming over the horizon not to wait until it invades your own household, but adequately and seasonably to prepare.

A prominent editor of a Chicago German newspaper, in its last leading editorial on the question, declared that if a break came with Germany the first problem this Government would face would be a race war, intimating that it would begin in Chicago. I am not intimidated nor dismayed by such a prospect. If it is no worse than the average riot in Chicago that I have seen, it will be a God-blessed relief. I do not think so. I am willing myself to take the chances in the western territory. Our polyglot races, I believe, are loyal. They know this Republic is for us all.

This morning by design, Mr. President, I sent to the desk and had read a letter which is one of many of a like kind that I have received. It was from Ellen Schmidt and her husband, Heinrich Schmidt. They are Germans. They did not come from Prussia. They came from other German States. When they sat in front of the old fireplace and watched the back log melt away in the long winter evenings, I heard them tell of the siege of Sebastopol. I have heard them tell of the struggles in the Crimean War, the men who in their later days were peaceful farmers in southern Illinois. I have heard them anathematize the father of the present Kaiser. The German people, it is true, when they face a foreign foe, are united; but in the day of reckoning, the day of settlement, Prussia will not forever dominate the public opinion of the German States. The Bavarian is essentially peaceful. The native of Saxony is essentially peaceful. I can call the roll of the States, and many of them are as kindly and humane and as peaceable as any American who sits in the quiet of his fireside to-night. So when Ellen Schmidt, the good soul, signing the name for her husband, wrote that they hoped the United States would preserve the principles and the traditional policies of this Republic laid down in the President's message, I know that there are some Germans in my country that do not approve of indiscriminate, ruthless warfare. I know, too, that their fathers came from Germany to escape the military service of that country. No militarism threatens this country except that of the Prussian. There is no militarism in this country. There is none in England. There is none in France; and there soon will be none, and but little of the Czar, in Russia. There is an awakening of democracy. Some have professed to say that nobody knows why this war is being waged, and why it has suddenly cast its ominous cloud over Europe and threatened the world.

The reason is patent to the observer. It is a war of democracy against absolutism; it is a war for the supremacy of civil power over that of the military—principles for which Jefferson wrote and Washington fought. Berlin is the only one of the great civilized powers of the world where in a time of peace a military officer can drive a citizen from the walks of the capital into the gutter, and when refused the privilege can run

him through with the sword, with no penalty save that of the camp, with no trial by the civil courts in time of peace. No; it is the only country in the world where martial law is supreme even in time of peace, and the military power is supreme even over the civil authorities. When a Prussian officer killed a German subject by running him through with his sword, an humble shoemaker, he was not tried in the civil courts of that Empire, he was court-martialed and given an insignificant sentence in time of peace. If a military officer of this Republic were to slap the most humble citizen of Washington with the flat of his sword and the citizen slew him on the spot in necessary self-defense, he would be recognized as acting strictly within his rights. If assaulted by the most exalted of our military officers, even by a rear admiral while doing land duty, and if he were killed, the military or the naval officer would be indicted by the proper court, prosecuted according to the ancient form, given a trial by jury, convicted, hanged, or sent to the binder-twine factory in the State of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] if it happened to be in that district, or to the rock quarries of Indiana, or to making good roads, where he would learn the lesson of all the ages that in this Republic in time of peace civil authority is supreme and the military authority must obey the law of the land.

They have not learned this everlasting lesson of the centuries under the Kaiser's government. It is a contest of democracy against the absolutism of the king and the rule of an unrestrained, unpunished military.

I have not time to read, Mr. President, but on some future occasion I will read from the works of Bernhardt. I can summarize it. There never was a more materialistic, thoroughly heartless, conscienceless, bloody, unjustifiable proclamation of might and the sword over right and human justice printed in the lids of a book since Cadmus invented letters or Gutenberg invented type. In that he proclaimed it to be the duty of the Imperial Government to carry German "kultur" around the world. If the "kultur" of the submarine and the slaughter of men, women, and children who are helpless be the form of culture and the fruit of Prussian militarism, for one this afternoon I wish to vote nay and voice my eternal protest against it. Germany under the incubus of Prussia, the blood and iron traditions of Bismarck, is not the Germany of Goethe, of Schiller, of Heine. It has made the soldier its emblem and force its law of life.

This country is full of every nationality in the world—allies, central powers, and all. For their votes, gained by a sacrifice of a world principle, I care nothing; for the discharge of the duty of this hour I care everything.

So, Mr. President, it is a question that we now meet at the threshold indicated by this resolution whether we rise to the level of the occasion, follow the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in time of war and the Chief Magistrate in time of peace, who is entitled to communicate with us in message, and to sustain or sever diplomatic relations—whether we follow him with heroic fidelity to the logic of the conclusions of the principle he has laid down or whether we abandon him to his fate. When we have done the latter we shall reap in due season the harvest of our folly.

This letter that I sent out to a great number who protested and some approved—about three to one approved, I think, so far as my correspondence and telegrams show—is dated February 6, 1917. In it I have stated my creed, my belief under present conditions, and on that I intend to shape my future course.

"It is intolerable to neutral nations that the sea be blockaded, as proposed by the German Government in its note of January 31, 1917. A blockade of the ports and marginal waters of the nations with which the central powers are at war is justified by the laws of war; but this does not carry with it the right to create such a zone as described, sow it with mines, and sink, by means of submarines or otherwise, as threatened, any neutral vessels found within the designated zone. Germany has as much right to declare the Atlantic Ocean a danger zone and warn neutrals to keep out of it. It resolves itself into might, not right.

"President Wilson's note of April 18, 1916, on the sinking of the *Sussex* without warning or saving the lives of the crew or passengers, among the latter of which were several citizens of the United States, said:

"Unless the Imperial Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether.

"To this the German Government replied:

"In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such

vessels, both within and without the area declared as naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance.

"By the note of January 31, 1917, already mentioned, the German Government declared it would act after February 1, 1917, 'by forcibly preventing in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and the eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included. All ships met within the zone will be sunk.'

"This means the revival of submarine naval warfare as in the *Lusitania* and *Sussex* cases without warning or the saving of life before destroying merchant ships. The loss of American citizens so caused is a violation of the rules of naval warfare. When to this is added that the neutral ships of the United States or its citizens shall be sunk without warning or saving the lives of passengers or crew the proposed course of the German Government is utterly indefensible. Both the laws of nations and the laws of humanity condemn it. This is a breach of a solemn pledge given us by the German Government.

"The question of warning our citizens to keep off belligerent merchant ships so armed as to be capable of sinking by a submarine presented a different issue. It is now, Shall our own neutral merchant ships be so destroyed? No loyal citizen of the United States can submit to such treatment of our people on the seas. Such naval warfare so threatened can scarcely be distinguished from piracy.

"I believe Great Britain has unlawfully interfered with our commerce. This relates entirely to merchandise taken in violation of property rights, and admits of reparation by paying damages. The lawless taking of the lives of American citizens by submarine warfare admits of no reparation. There is a marked difference between a cargo of merchandise and human lives, between condemning property in a prize court and drowning women and children at sea. Murder can not be justified by showing that another has previously unlawfully deprived the dead, when living, of their property. Such a course acquiesced in compels us in its necessary effect to cease to trade with neutral countries. The German Government has entered on that course which our Government and its people can not endure. If persevered in but one course is open. It is with infinite regret I observe the desperate expedient of Germany. Unless abandoned it means for our country war. I approve the President's message of February 3, 1917."

I have read this verbatim, and I ask that it be inserted not in the usual small type in cases of this kind but in the same type as the ordinary Record is published.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHERMAN. With these remarks I close, although there is very much more that I should like to say. In the short time that is properly given for the discussion of the resolution I think it would be an abuse of privilege as a Senator to take further time. I can only express the hope that the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Missouri will receive so signal a majority in this Chamber that it will be notice to the world, and especially to all Europe concerned, that the American people are a unit, and that we are with our Chief Magistrate in his address.

Mr. STONE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are taken I feel it my duty under the circumstances to say a few words in support of the resolution. I am from a State that contains a large proportion of foreign-born inhabitants, and many of them are poignantly desirous of seeing an amicable termination of the present crisis. I share their anxiety with them, and I would do nothing willfully to bring about war with Germany or any other nation if it can honorably, yes, decently, be avoided. I would do nothing which in my judgment would hasten a war that would be of our own making. We say we want peace. Of course we want peace. No Senator or Representative has arisen in Congress who does not want peace, but the question has arisen in our own minds how can peace be preserved, and can it best be preserved by evading responsibilities, by relinquishing rights, by suffering injustice, or is it the safest and wisest course to pursue before it is too late to assert our rights so that those who are about to trespass upon those rights may know the consequences if they so continue to trespass?

The issue that is presented here this afternoon is not a new issue. It has been in the making for two and a half years. Congress went on record in favor of it nearly a year ago. The country is on record in favor of the issue presented here by the resolution. It went on record in the recent campaign. The press of the country has gone on record; the citizens of the United States have gone on record long ago. The situation is not as

though it were a new one that had been suddenly thrust upon us for the first time. We have been considering it, I say, for nearly two and a half years.

I want to say that since the sinking of the *Lusitania* this question has been upon us. Who has kept the country at peace during the past two and a half years? The President of the United States has done more to keep the country out of war than any other one man in the United States. If he had chosen to listen to counsel on one side or to counsel on the other, if he had not had his feet firmly planted upon the rocks of peace, the rock of right, and the rock of justice he would have been shoved from his position into war and he would have dragged this country with him months and months ago.

When Senators talk peace I want to say there is one man in the United States who will not have to yield to any Member of this body or any other man in the United States on the proposition of striving for peace, and that man is the President of the United States, for in all the months that these matters have been discussed the President of the United States, day in and day out, yes, and through the night, has been in every way possible endeavoring to secure peace consistent with the honor and the welfare and the interests of this country.

Two years ago when Congress adjourned in March who was left alone here in Washington to protect the honor, the interests, and the peace of the United States? The President of the United States. Senators went home, Representatives went home, attending to their own business, pursuing their pleasure in their own way, and left him alone here with the burden and with the responsibility of keeping us at peace, and he did so! Notwithstanding the sinking of the *Lusitania*, notwithstanding the sinking of the *Sussex*, notwithstanding all the ills that we have suffered at the hands of belligerents he has still maintained peace.

Then the question of the sinking of the *Lusitania* arose.

Everybody knows how the country was excited, how men were wrought up, how quite a respectable number of our citizens believed that we should not tolerate a barbarous warfare, such as it was denounced, to be continued against us or our citizens. Through the summer, through the fall, through the winter, and through the next spring in notes after notes, in negotiations after negotiations, we had this matter up with Germany and her allies. I might add that in connection with that we had other issues up with the entente allies. There is not any question in my mind that our rights have been invaded by the entente allies, and complicated with this question of the taking of American lives was the further question with the opposite side who were invading our rights upon the high seas. Let me say right here that I resent the wrongs we have suffered at the hands of Great Britain on the high seas, and let me say further that they deserve drastic treatment and a heroic remedy, if necessary, to cure her of her tendencies, short of severing relations. The wrongs we suffered at her hands could be compensated in dollars; and if the wrongs we have now to fear at the hands of Germany, if she carries out her threat, were of the same character, and not as they in truth are, not susceptible to money compensation, we could also bide our time to right our wrongs with her.

But it is perfectly obvious, is it not, that we had to seek redress for the killing of our citizens first and to prevent a recurrence of the same capital wrongs suffered at the hands of Germany. We had to settle that matter which appears to me the most grievous invasion of our rights, and that was the taking of the lives of our citizens upon the high seas. Very well; did the country believe in that stand? Does anybody here wish to rise and say that the American people did not stand back of the President in his attempt to safeguard the lives of American citizens?

I remember the resolutions that were offered here. I remember how it was proposed that we warn citizens to stay off the high seas and place an embargo on munitions of war. All those questions were settled, at least those that came up here, and how were they decided? Decided in favor of the President's stand. Decided in favor of the right of our citizens to exercise their proper rights and their God-given right to live. The country stood back of the President, the press stood back of him, the citizens stood back of him, and the Senate and the House of Representatives stood back of him.

Ah, Mr. President, not only did the people of the United States stand back of the President, but Germany and her allies admitted the justice and soundness of our demands. It would be well to remember it is not quite a year ago when the ultimatum was given to Germany. And when pressure had been brought upon the President and upon Congress to recede from the position he had taken, Germany admitted the correctness of his position, did she not? The world admitted the cor-

rectness of our position, and it was promised on behalf of Germany that she would not again engage in the ruthless submarine warfare against which we complained. She recognized our rights and complied with our demands.

Now, it is true that a condition was attached to Germany's pledges, namely, to the effect that she reserved the purpose to resume her ruthless operations in the event of certain contingencies happening or not happening, but it is also true that the President, in a note immediately afterwards sent, explicitly and emphatically refused to accept Germany's pledges except unconditionally, and thus, by her acquiescence she recognized that we accepted her pledges unconditionally and not otherwise.

Ah, but, Mr. President, she did not even attempt to reserve that purpose on the grounds that our demands were unjust or our position untenable. No; she only attempted to reserve her purpose in retaliation against England for her alleged unlawful warfare. She admitted that she had no right to sink the *Sussex* when she agreed to make reparation and apologized for her acts. She did not place the reason for her yielding to our demands then upon the ground of expediency, but she admitted the correctness and the soundness of the position of the President of the United States in the premises. We thought it was all settled. So it seemed to be entirely settled. The sunshine of peace once more spread its rays over the land, and we supposed this matter was forever settled. Nay, to make it doubly sure the President, in a supplemental note, came out and said that while there might be something said in the German reply that might be construed as attaching conditions to the recognition of our rights, under no circumstances could we discuss, much less consider, any such condition as that, and that these rights were not relative but absolute; single not joint.

So the world approved our position. The neutral nations approved our position, the belligerent nations approved our position, Germany herself approved our position. Who was there, then, to question it? Nobody.

So we went before the people in the campaign, and we gave an accounting to the people of the United States of the record of the President in the handling of our foreign affairs, and the people approved it and reelected him to conduct our affairs for another four years.

Now, since that time considerable water has gone under the bridge. The President, after the war cloud had apparently passed away, undertook to bring a message of peace to the world. The people were glad to see him take that course. Some, indeed, thought that he was favoring one set of the combatants against the other, but the world knows and we know that the President had only at heart the best interests of the United States, which we all have at heart, and the welfare of the whole world.

Now, after endeavoring to be the peacemaker, after having settled things that had vexed us, after having done things that the world had indorsed, we are suddenly confronted by another note from Germany, withdrawing what she had promised us before and saying that she proposed to resume again that warfare which by her own action and her own admissions she had herself denounced, and for which she had agreed to make reparation to us, and which she had pledged herself never to do again.

So the President has not changed, the country has not changed, Congress has not changed, the world has not changed; but Germany has changed. She has now changed her position, not upon grounds of principle, but only upon grounds of expediency or necessity.

Mr. Bethmann-Hollweg, chancellor, in responding to the questions of the members of the Reichstag as to why he had apparently changed his position, said he had not changed his position; that while he had said something that might be construed as being against ruthless submarine warfare, he had only hesitated and refused at that time to be in favor of unrestricted and ruthless submarine warfare purely on the ground of expediency, namely, because Germany was not then ready for it, but added that Germany was ready for it now. All the time when we supposed that the justice of our position had been vindicated by Germany herself she was merely waiting, according to the words of the chancellor, an opportunity when she would be ready. She thinks now that she can with impunity violate the laws of humanity and the laws of God because she is ready to conduct the campaign of lawlessness successfully.

Now, she has threatened that. The question now arises are we, the Congress of the United States, going to vindicate the United States or are we going to ignore the threats or condone in advance the things which Germany threatens she will do? Are we going to quail before the challenge which she has bluntly thrown

down to us and repudiate our Government and our people's rights?

Are we going now to record a vote of lack of confidence in the President, whom we have supported and led on in the belief that Congress was back of him, and in the belief that the world was back of him? Are we, upon a mere threat going to abandon him, the leader of our country, the President of the United States, and thus repudiate our rights and vindicate and condone the repetition of the terrible acts of which we complained and which Germany admitted were unjustifiable and which she pledged herself not to repeat.

That is the issue here in this resolution, Mr. President. I want to say that I am here not merely to say, "Mr. President, you have done this and you have closed my mouth, and I must perforce indorse what you have done." I want to go further and say that I approve of what the President has done because it is right and because the people have told him in advance that it was right and because he had a right to expect that when he took the position he has taken the country and Congress would line up back of him and sustain him as against a foreign country.

Now, it is said this may lead to war. God forbid that it should. This is not, however, a step that leads to war. It may be the only step that will still lead to peace. In union there is strength, and our diplomacy can have no strength when it appears that we are divided upon a momentous issue.

In the last two and a half years, during all the time that these great questions have been pending, the President has been sadly handicapped and hamstrung by a divided constituency. It would be too long and it would be fruitless to enter into a discussion here of the currents and the countercurrents that have been set adrift in this country to trip and to hamper the President of the United States in carrying out his foreign policy. Suffice it to say that he has been hampered, that obstacles have been put in his path which have hindered him from getting the benefit of the full force of a united American Nation.

The word has gone out into the world that the American people are divided on this issue. It has been said, and boldly said, more than once, that in the event of one thing happening or another thing happening, we could not command a united Americanism to sustain us. That has had its effect, no doubt, in our foreign relations, because there is nothing one nation fears less than another nation divided, and nothing which they fear or respect more than another nation united.

This is not merely a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of practical importance. I sometimes think that if any mistake has been made—I do not say that there has been—it has not been because we have a bloodthirsty President and a bloodthirsty administration, but it has been because we have been too solicitous about the feelings of other people and because we feared that we might involve at every step, unnecessarily, that due insistence upon a respect of our rights. I think we should assume, on the other hand, that an insistence upon a recognition of our rights would tend to keep us out of war. Urgent demands are resented, of course, but just demands are recognized when energetically presented.

I believe when the first breach of international law occurred the neutral nations of the world should have put the seal of their condemnation upon it at once and have tolerated it from no nation, because the yielding of one right invites the trespassing on another; and there is no end to the transgressing of an aggressive and unscrupulous force upon an ever yielding and never resistant force.

As was said here to-day, if there can be a blockade of the North Sea, why not a blockade three or four hundred miles from there? Why not a blockade a thousand miles? Why not a blockade 3,000 miles? Why not, eventually, a blockade just before our very door? And when the blockade gets before our very door, instead of defending our rights, will we still cry "Peace!" and and refuse to stand by the Government or our rights?

However, prudent men oftentimes know just when to stop, and prudent nations often know just when to stop; and I want to ask whether we are not in that situation now and whether the President did not have the idea in mind when he delivered his passports to the German ambassador that now is the time to call a halt?

It has been said here that two ways were open: One was for the President to send another note threatening that, in the event the German threat was carried out, we would resent it with force of arms, and the other was to hand Count von Bernstorff his passports. Which was the wiser thing to do? Was it to wait until Germany had actually committed the overt act and to put upon us the burden and the onus of declaring war,

or to serve notice on Germany in the most kindly way, but in the most emphatic manner, that here was a line over which she might not step, and thus take for granted that a prudent and wise nation would halt before it takes the final and fatal step?

I say the President, in my judgment, acted in the best manner possible, and that the issue now is up to Germany whether she wants to continue something which she herself has condemned by solemn note or treaty negotiations, or whether she wants to insist that she deceived the United States, that she misled the United States, and that she proposes to recognize no other law on the face of the earth than that of necessity. It is true that she is fighting with her back to the wall; that allowances should be made for a nation in desperate straits; but, as I understand, while international law takes into consideration the necessities of nations, it yet holds that no nation can invoke the law of necessity against the rights of neutral nations and the lives of citizens of neutral nations.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall have peace; but I know and I feel that if we expect to have a peaceful outcome of this difficulty we must have a united country; so that word shall go forward, not that this is merely Mr. Wilson's idea—the idea of Mr. Wilson, the individual, Mr. Wilson, the President—but rather the word that when the President speaks he speaks for the whole country, and that the country stands behind that speech and is willing to back it up as far as it may be necessary to do so.

I noticed the other day in the public press that in Germany the newspapers were not speaking of a breach of relations with "the American people," but they were speaking of a breach of Germany with President Wilson. What does that mean? It means, does it not, on the part of those who use that language that they do not recognize that Mr. Wilson is speaking for the people of the United States, but that he is speaking only for himself, not for the country, not as the responsible head of a great Nation?

I repeat, I hope we shall have peace; I say that if we earnestly desire peace, and if peace can possibly be preserved or war avoided at this time, it can only be done by every nation on the face of this earth being informed that the United States is a united country; that even though we have people living in our midst who feel aggrieved at this breach of relations, when the solemn hour comes when it is necessary to choose between the Government to which they have sworn allegiance and the land which gave them birth, no matter what their ancestry may be, they will elect to stand by the land of their adoption, to stand by this country, regardless of the cost and the sacrifice which it may mean to them.

The President in every line of his speech before Congress breathes the expression of good will and conciliation; but he lays down flatly and emphatically upon what terms this friendship may be retained. We are now called upon either to give him a vote of confidence or to withhold it; to give a vote of confidence to him not for doing something to which we have been opposed in the past, but for something to which we have been committed for the past two years, and for which we have supported him in every way and at every turn that the question may have taken. This is not only a vote of confidence or lack of confidence, but it is also a vote going to the solidarity and integrity of this country. It must not go out to the world that this country has turned down the President of the United States, who has acted within his proper functions and in accordance with justice and right.

It would be different, Mr. President, if we had at the head of this Nation a man who had gone mad, who was a tyrant, a usurper of power; but nobody doubts the patriotism of our President, no one doubts his ability, no one doubts his peaceful purposes, no one doubts that he is acting solely for what he conceives to be the best interests of this country. For two and one-half years Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, has stood between us and war. His every effort, his every thought, his every wish and desire has been to conduct us safely through this crisis. It seemed, indeed, that he had succeeded in his heart's desire. Perhaps he will yet. Every one of his fellow citizens knows that if there be any way consistent with our honor and our rights or our interests to stay the awful hand of war it will be pursued. I am confident that our Government or our President will do nothing to promote war and that everything will be done to prevent war, if it can be avoided. Let the whole country, let a united citizenry, stand back of the man who has done his full duty through more than two crushing years. Let him feel now the helpful moral support of his fellow citizens in this hour of crisis. Thus, if at all, can be best avoided what we all dread and would all avoid.

Let us stand by the President because we thus stand by our country.

Is it going to be said that we repudiate our President and our Government? Have you stopped to think what the consequences would be should we repudiate the head of our Government, our spokesman who stands for our rights and the rights of humanity? If you take the helmsman from the helm, who will conduct the ship through the storm and turbulent waters? A President can not resign; he must still be President; and if you repudiate him, how could he serve you? He would speak as an individual and not as a nation. Of course I know it will not be done in a crisis like this. The people of the United States do not elect to the high office of President a man who deserved or who would be accorded such treatment. The time has not yet come nor that stage of degeneration yet set in when the people of the United States will refuse to stand by the United States.

Mr. President, I repeat I hope we may have peace. I hope I may never be obliged as a Senator to register my vote in favor of war. I hope the awful responsibility will never devolve upon me to decree that men must fight and die for our country. My thoughts, my purposes, my prayers are solely and alone for what I conceive to be the good of my country. May my judgment be clarified so that my voice and my vote will ever be found in truth and in fact for that which will redound to the good of the country and the happiness of our people. Whatever errors I may make in this Chamber will, I am sure, be errors of the head and not of the heart, and if I err now in the position I am taking I pray that a kind Providence may overlook it. But, in my judgment, it would be fatal to defeat this resolution now that it is before us. It would make for disintegration and not union to divide ourselves upon this issue. It would be unpatriotic, dangerous, and unwise to refuse to approve and indorse the acts of the President done within the line of his duty and his jurisdiction, and to give notice to the world that we are not a united but a divided and disorganized people. I shall feel constrained to vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words before voting on the pending proposition.

I shall vote to sustain the resolution, but in voting to sustain it I am not passing judgment upon either the propriety or impropriety of having the resolution before the Senate. It is before us and we must vote on it. If I felt that in supporting this resolution we were taking one step nearer to war, I should pause, and pause very long, before casting a vote in its favor; but, Mr. President, instead of bringing us nearer, I believe that a united front in support of this resolution at this critical time will do more to prevent war than any one thing we could do to-day. Recalling the past diplomatic utterances of the President on the submarine controversy, his declaration of what he would be compelled to do under certain circumstances, I can not see how after receiving the last German declaration he could do less than he has done or more than he has done in severing diplomatic relations with the German Government.

Mr. President, it might be well to pause right here before going further to ask ourselves what are the rights that the President of the United States claims for the American people and which we stand pledged to maintain? I do not believe that the President questions for a single moment the right of Germany to place restrictions upon trade in munitions of war with her enemies. We do not for a single moment deny her right of blockade; we do not claim upon our part that we can without interference send munitions of war or other contraband into the British Islands. All we are claiming, if I understand the President's address aright, is simply that in the exercise of the right of a belligerent to prevent the importation of munitions or other contraband of war into an enemy country he shall exercise the usual precautions that are required by international law. What we claim is, not that we may break that blockade which Germany has declared around the British Islands; not that Germany may not seize any American ship that is laden with contraband; but what we claim is that the question of whether a ship is carrying contraband and the question of her right to enter that zone shall be determined before the vessel is sunk.

It is up to Germany to say whether or not she will accede to that demand of the United States. Certainly it seems to me that the Imperial German Government will not seriously contend that she has a right to declare that only one American ship shall sail from the United States to Falmouth if she carries nothing but mail, or that she can sail but once a week, or that she can limit the number of ships of American registry that may sail the ocean or that may carry our goods not declared contraband or our mails and passengers even to a belligerent port.

We do not deny, and we can not deny, her right to maintain her blockade; but is it necessary for the protection of the life and existence of the German Empire that she sink without notice American ships not laden with contraband? Is it not necessary,

even though such vessels are laden with contraband, that she shall determine that question before they are sent to the bottom of the ocean? Is it necessary to preserve her life that she destroy American lives by this method? I do not believe, Mr. President, that the great central powers will claim that that is essential; and if we do not insist upon international conduct which we would not concede to others were we engaged in a war, I do not believe there is any real danger of war with the Imperial German Government. We only claim that questions of contraband and questions of the innocence of vessels traversing the war zone shall be determined before, and not after, they are sent to the bottom.

Mr. President, I was one among the thirteen in the Senate who declared it to be the duty of the American Government to suggest to American citizens that they ought not needlessly to travel in the war zone during hostilities and during a time when we were attempting to settle mooted questions with one of the belligerent powers. I am still of the same conviction. I feel that American citizens owe a patriotic duty to this Government to keep us out of war, if possible, and that if they will refrain from exercising every international right they may have, and remain upon American soil when it is not necessary for them to visit the war zone, they will confer a blessing upon their country by keeping it out of any possible war with any of the belligerents.

I hope that that will be done; but if it is not done, it is still within the power of Germany easily to keep out of war with the United States. It is within her power to unleash the dogs of war if she pleases so to do, but by exercising a due consideration for the rights of humanity and the rights of neutral vessels she can avoid war with us.

I am certain, Mr. President, that the President of the United States will do everything in his power to keep us out of any armed conflict, and that he will require the most positive proof of a flagrant abuse of international law and of the rights of American citizens before he will come to the Congress and ask us for armed force to maintain our rights. But it seems to me, Mr. President, that there is nothing else we can do at the present time except to say to the Imperial German Government and to the nations of the world that when the President severs diplomatic relations with any belligerent power, when he declares a great principle of international law, which we all concede to be the law, and insists that we shall maintain our rights according to the terms of that declaration, it becomes our duty to sustain him in a vote of confidence. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the resolution, but I shall now and at all other times do all in my power, all I can do within the bounds of national honor, to keep this country out of this great world conflict.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I merely ask for a vote on the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate will read the resolution very carefully before they vote upon it. The minds of Senators are already made up on the questions that are involved in the present controversy. All Senators earnestly desire to avoid war if it can honorably be done. All Senators will loyally support the administration if war is declared. On those two propositions I believe there is absolute unanimity.

But on two other questions there is substantial disagreement: First, as to whether diplomatic relations with Germany should have been severed, and, second, as to what cause might be sufficient to warrant a declaration of war.

On reading the resolution I find that it is distinctly of a peaceful character. It is in no sense a preliminary declaration of war. I have come to the conclusion which I have stated, because I know the source of the resolution, and I have carefully considered its terms. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the author of the measure, firmly desires peace and that he will go further than a majority of this body to secure peace. But when I read the resolution I am sure that the intention of it is peaceable.

The body of the resolution asks for the approval of the action of the President as set forth in his address. The only action set forth by the President in his address was the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany. There is, moreover, no declaration by him as to whether war should be undertaken.

The preamble of the resolution states three propositions: First, that the President has severed diplomatic relations with Germany. That is the very matter involved in the resolution; second, that the President has expressed his desire to avoid

conflict with Germany; and, third, that the President has declared that he will submit the matter to Congress and ask its authority before he takes further action. The two propositions stated in the preamble which do not appear in the body of the proposition, are distinctly peaceful and they were inserted before the body of the resolution for the express purpose of declaring our peaceful attitude and our peaceful intent.

Some of us, if we had had the responsibility, would not have suspended diplomatic relations with Germany. Others would have taken that course. But that is not the question before the Senate. That action has already passed into history. What is before us now is, whether we shall approve the action of the President in severing relations with Germany. And I wish to appeal to those of our friends on the floor of the Senate who particularly desire peace to help us get a unanimous vote to support the action of the President because in doing that they will emphasize the two peace-looking sentiments expressed in the preamble and help to present a united front to all the world. It is more important that we stand unanimously in support of the President at this time than that we express our own personal views as to just what should be done to avert the conflict that we all wish to avert.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think there has been more debate than was needed on this resolution, which, I think, might well have been spontaneously, unanimously, and without debate adopted immediately upon being laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the author of the resolution, having expressed a desire for a vote, I will merely indulge in a few sentences to explain my motives in voting for the resolution.

It has been stated by some Senators on the floor of the Senate during this debate that they would vote for this resolution regardless of whether or not they believed the President was right in his action of last Saturday in severing our diplomatic relations with Germany, perhaps believing that he may have been wrong. It has been stated by some Senators that they would vote for this resolution, while at the same time deprecating the fact that the resolution was brought before the Senate; and at least one Senator on this side of the Chamber has stated that he would vote for the resolution, while at the same time deprecating that it was brought before the Senate and condemning the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] for having introduced it.

I merely want to go on record and make it plain, before the vote is taken on this resolution, that I am not one of those Senators who will vote for the resolution regardless of whether or not I believe the President was right, perhaps believing that he was wrong. I want to take it plain that I am not one of those Senators who will vote for the resolution while at the same time deprecating that it is before the Senate and condemning the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] for having brought it before the Senate. I will vote for this resolution because I believe that the President was absolutely right in what he did; that it was his plain and manifest duty to do what he did; and that it is the duty of the Senate voluntarily and spontaneously to come to his support and uphold him in maintaining the honor and dignity of the Nation.

I believe that President Wilson was absolutely right; I believe that he would have been justified long ago in doing what he did; I believe he would have been justified in what he did at the time of the sinking of the *Lusitania*. The President has been very patient; he has waited until he arrived at the point, in my opinion, where it was absolutely his duty and where there was no escape from it, to take the action which he has taken. If the President had not done what he did, this Nation would have received, and would have merited, the contempt of the civilized world.

In April of last year the President sent a note to Germany, informing that Government that if certain practices were continued and persisted in or resumed he would break off diplomatic relations with that country. Now, Germany sends him a note, stating that she intends to do those very things, thereby placing the President and the people of this country in a position where they could not fail to meet that challenge if they desired to maintain their self-respect and uphold the honor and dignity of this Nation before the world. The action of the President was unavoidable. It was the only thing to do. I undertake to say, too, that the people of this country are behind the President and are supporting him in this matter. The press shows it; the State legislatures, by their action, show it. There is no doubt that the people stand with the President. Should we do less? Are we not as patriotic as our constituents?

If the President had not done as he did, the people of this country would have been put down before the world as a

Nation of poltroons and cowards. They would have been put in the attitude of favoring peace at any price, even at the sacrifice of our commerce, our international rights, our rights on the seas, our self-respect, our national honor, integrity, and dignity, and so there was no other course to pursue.

It has been stated here that the President should have sent another note to Germany. If the President had sent another note to Germany, I think he would have made this country absurd and ridiculous in the eyes of the world. It was not a time for notes; it was a time for action.

It has been intimated here that the President should have let the Senate know that he wants this body to uphold him if this resolution is to be adopted. Has the patriotism of this body sunk so low that when the President is engaged in upholding the honor, the dignity, and the self-respect of this Nation we should sit here idly and wait to be told that he would like to have our support before we go to his support? Must we be solicited to do our patriotic duty? This body should rush to our President's support voluntarily, spontaneously, and eagerly when he is upholding the honor and dignity and respect of our country, as he is. The action of this body should be voluntary, unsolicited, spontaneous, unqualified, and ungrudging in giving the President support in what he is doing. Our national honor is at stake. We should be as jealous of it as our President.

As to the action of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in introducing this resolution, if I have any complaint at all to make, it is that he did not offer the resolution last Saturday afternoon. If I have any complaint at all to make of the Senate, it is that the Senate did not unanimously and eagerly adopt this resolution last Saturday afternoon, and let the news be flashed around the world that this body upholds the President, simultaneously with the news of his communication to Congress of his action in severing diplomatic relations with Germany. I think it was not only the right but the duty of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to offer this resolution. From whom could it more appropriately come? He is our leader in matters pertaining to foreign relations; he is our spokesman in matters pertaining to foreign relations; and it is appropriate, fit, and proper that this resolution should be introduced by him. It was not only his privilege but his duty, and if he had not done it within a reasonable time I think some other Member of this body should have done it. But it naturally comes with more appropriateness, fitness, and propriety from the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, than from any other Member of this body. If the action of the President should lead to war, it would not be his fault; it would not be our fault. The responsibility would be upon those who challenge our honor and insist on violating our rights. The President is a patient, peace-loving man. He has shown it; but he cherishes our honor and rights, and is not afraid to defend them; neither should we be. In such matters we should be his loyal supporters, and should make it known to the world.

I will vote for this resolution gladly and ungrudgingly, because I believe the President is absolutely right, because I believe that he did his duty; because I believe he is upholding the honor, the dignity, and the rights of this Nation; and because I believe it to be the duty of this body to go voluntarily and spontaneously to his support in doing so. We should fly to his support. Wait to be told that he would like to have our support? That is unthinkable. Perish the thought! Let us be as one with our President in defying a challenge of our rights from any nation or power on earth. Let no man, nation, or power think for an instant that in matters of national honor this body hesitates or wavers for a second in its loyal allegiance to our leader, our champion, our patient, prudent, time-tried, and soul-tested President.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, when the President delivered his message in joint session in the House of Representatives on the 3d of this month I was asked to give an expression as to whether I approved or disapproved of the President's message. I said, Mr. President, that not knowing the conditions as the President knew them, I was willing to take his judgment, and that it was probably the only thing left for him to do. But, Mr. President, that has nothing whatever to do with the resolution which has been introduced here by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and I regret exceedingly that it has been brought into this body. This is only a Senate resolution. The Senate can confer no additional power upon the President of the United States that is not already conferred upon him by the Constitution of our country, and to say that we must pass this resolution merely for the purpose of showing to the country and to the world that we have confidence in the President, it seems to me, is not a sufficient argument to ask us to vote for it.

Of course, every loyal citizen of this country will support the President of the United States when he needs our support; but it has been stated upon this floor by the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the President of the United States has not asked for the passage of this resolution.

Mr. President, the fathers of this country very wisely provided that the Congress of the United States alone has the power to declare war. The President of the United States has acted, he has exhausted his constitutional powers, and I have not criticized him. He has done all that he can do under the power conferred upon him by the Constitution. The question will have to be solved by the Congress and not by the President. As much as I am interested in the President of the United States, and willing, as I may be, to follow him when he is right—which I assume he would be in so grave a cause as this, Mr. President—I am more interested in the welfare of the people of the United States than in any one man; and I, for one, am not willing to yield a single iota to any man, whether it is the President or anyone else.

Mr. President, I shall not vote for this resolution. I am opposed to this resolution, because it has no proper place in this body. It does not confer upon the President any additional power whatever. I think I have demonstrated during the short time that I have served in Congress that when the President of the United States needed my support he has always received it. I have not been one of those who have criticized him for the mistakes that have been made in dealing with countries closer to us than Germany, and the Members of the Senate know it.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go into this resolution and discuss it at length. I think it would have been a great deal better if it had never been introduced and if it had never been discussed. The country knows that every Member of the Senate will stand by the President in time of need. This resolution simply provides that we shall, by our votes in the Senate, show that we have confidence in him. If the President of the United States should send a message to Congress asking for appropriations for war purposes or upon a declaration of war it would have to be acted upon by both branches of Congress. I want to be free to vote as I see my duty. I do not wish to bind myself now to vote for any measure, regardless of whether it is in accordance with the wishes of the people whom I represent and the wishes of the people of this great Nation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am satisfied that the motives of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in offering this resolution were of the highest and most patriotic character. I think, with reference to many of the questions connected with this situation, his views and mine are very much alike.

I objected to laying aside the unfinished business to take up this resolution. I did it because I believed this resolution to be ill advised, inopportune, and wholly uncalled for. I did it because I feared that just exactly what has occurred would take place. I do not know what others think about it, but I think that the debate to-day is the most unfortunate occurrence that has taken place in connection with this whole matter. It is very unfortunate that divisions should appear among us when we are confronted with the situation that now confronts us.

I am not going to discuss the various issues that may be considered to be involved in the matter, many of which have been discussed by Senators. I simply want to explain my position, in view of the fact that a roll call has been ordered upon the resolution. In my judgment, it would have been far better if no roll call had been asked for, and if the record had been made in such a way as to indicate no special division among us. But the roll call has been insisted upon and has been ordered, and I want to say just a few words.

I have always taken this position with reference to the acts of the President: Whenever the President acts, in our relations with foreign countries, within his powers under the Constitution, his act, as I look at it, becomes the act of the Government and country; and I am for my country right or wrong. It seems to be generally conceded, and I assume, that the President acted in this matter entirely within his constitutional powers. What was done was his act as it was done; but when he did it, it became the act of our Government; and as such, without questioning it in one way or the other, I would stand back of it and uphold and support it no matter what my personal views might be. I consider that my duty, so far as I am concerned, as a citizen and as a Senator.

Like the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], however, I wish to say that I do not consider that I am bound in any way whatsoever or limited in any way whatsoever by my vote upon this resolution in the course I shall take if, unfortunately, the question of a declaration of war shall be presented to this

Congress. Then will come a question that I must pass upon as a Member of one of the war-declaring bodies of the Government. Then whatever is done will be my responsibility, and I shall pass upon that as I deem to be wise, proper, and patriotic without feeling that I am restricted or limited or bound in any manner or form by this resolution or by my action upon it.

I am going to vote for the resolution, as it is here, simply because the act that it approves, so far as I consider it approves any act, has become the act of my Government, and nothing that I can do or say would undo it in any way.

A few days ago I delivered an address, and I want to repeat just a few words that I used then as expressing my views now. I said then, referring to this issue, that all partisanship should be laid aside. All former allegiance should be smothered. Our Americanism should be supreme. Devotion to and support of our Government, right or wrong, should be the watchword of each one of us. Our country now should have our sole and undivided loyalty. Our Government must assert and maintain the rights of its citizens; and you—referring to the people to whom I was speaking—and I owe it to our Americanism to support the Government, and we will do it.

Every American, however, worthy of the name, will do his part in this critical hour and refrain from exercising his right to travel for pleasure, or trade for profit, in order that his beloved country may not be drawn into this hell of ruin, suffering, and death.

It would be a crime against humanity, and a travesty upon the people's Government, if national honor may be used by selfish pleasure and lustful greed to involve 100,000,000 of peace-loving people in war. The Nation owes to its citizens protection in their legal rights, but the citizen owes it to his Government to make sacrifices to keep it out of war. Surely, if the many are expected and are willing to offer their lives to maintain the Nation's honor, the few will be willing to forego pleasure and gain that the Nation's honor may not be attacked. In behalf of the humanity of America I appeal to every citizen to be patriotic in peace as he expects others to be patriotic in war.

Mr. President, I hope there may go out an appeal to the citizens of this country in this hour of danger; and I wish that our press, instead of continually urging war preparations and all that sort of thing, would lend its influence in an appeal to the people of this country, as was suggested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] a few moments ago, to stay at home, to refrain from exercising the rights that the Government has asserted it will maintain to travel for pleasure or for profit, and not put themselves not only where they are in danger but where they endanger the peace and the prosperity of their country.

If we should declare war, we would expect the sons of our homes to offer themselves as volunteers to defend with their lives the country's honor. How much more ought we to expect our citizens to stay at home, not because they may not have the right to travel but in the interest of peace and the safety of our country? I should like to see coupled with this resolution a statement by the Senate that while we will assert and maintain the rights of our people, we will appeal to them to make some sacrifices in order that peace may stay with us, in order that we may not be confronted with the terrible alternative of war or national dishonor. I hope that the few of this country that may be tempted to go abroad, whose rights the Nation may have to maintain if they are endangered, will just deny themselves the exercise of these rights and show their patriotism and their love for country by doing this for just a little while. That will insure peace. That will show their patriotism. That will bring to them the consciousness that they have done their duty as citizens and preserved the peace of their country and the happiness of its homes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I am going to be very brief; and I make that statement in order that I may, if possible, induce Senators to listen to me for just a few moments.

Mr. LANE. That is offered as a bribe, Mr. President.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the Senate is undoubtedly the greatest debating society on earth. That is a question that we might view from different angles. Some people may approve of it and others may reprobate it; but, for one, I hate to see the Senate become a debating society for moot questions and undertake to decide moot questions. I hate to see the Senate continually called on to express its opinion about matters that are not within its constitutional powers and upon which it is not called on to act.

I recall that not two years ago it was considered almost lese majeste throughout this country that either House of Congress should express an opinion on what were called the Gore resolution in one body and the McLeMore resolution in the other,

warning American citizens not to travel on ships of belligerent nations; and the argument was then advanced, with so much force that both Houses of Congress yielded to it by tremendous majorities, that those questions were being settled by the President in a diplomatic way, in the proper exercise of his constitutional functions, and that the Congress had no concern whatever in it and no power with respect to it.

I thought that was true then. If it was true then, it is true to-day; and the Congress of the United States as such, and neither House of the Congress of the United States, is called upon to take, nor indeed can it take, any constitutional, legal action with respect to sending the ambassador of a foreign country away from this country or recalling our own ambassador from a foreign country. Now, if that be so—and no Senator will controvert it—then it seems to me, as an original proposition, that the contention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is manifestly sound, and that the Senate of the United States, one of the great constitutional law-making bodies of the Government, ought not to be called on to express any opinion whatever except about matters that come within its powers and about which it can take definite and constitutional action.

So much for that; but the question is here, and must be dealt with. It is just as well, Mr. President, for Senators to realize exactly what we are doing by this resolution, and for the country and the world to realize exactly what this resolution is and what it means.

Leaving out the preamble—and preambles never amount to anything; they always weaken a resolution or a law—the resolution that the Senate is called on to pass is this:

Resolved, That the Senate approves the action taken by the President as set forth in his address delivered before the joint session of the Congress as above stated.

The resolution is that the Senate approves the action of the President. What was the action? The action was that he gave the German ambassador his passports and recalled our ambassador from Berlin. Well, Mr. President, I will say if my opinion is desired in an ultraconstitutional way, that I do approve that action. I approve it for two reasons: First, because the President acted within his constitutional powers in taking it, and if he did not violate or exceed his constitutional powers, it is our duty to approve it, because he is the recognized organ of the Government for taking such action. Above that and beyond that, I approve the action for another and a very different reason, and a very weighty one, I think. To these Senators on both sides of this Chamber who have expressed their devotion to the cause of peace, I desire to say that I yield to no one in devotion to that cause, but it is my judgment that the President could have taken no weightier step, could have adopted no more effective method of promoting the cause of peace than to let the Imperial Government of Germany realize the intense gravity of the situation, to enforce upon that Government the view that this is a matter of the utmost gravity, and that the American people so regard it. If it was necessary to do something more than write notes—and I believe it was—if it was necessary to do something more than employ mere words to drive that conviction home to the German heart, then the President has adopted the only method that he could constitutionally adopt, the only method short of war itself that this country can adopt, to make the German Government realize how serious the situation is, and how seriously our people regard it. If anything on this earth, Senators, can promote peace, if anything on this earth can preserve peace and maintain peace with the German Government, it will be because the German Government and people realize, and it is driven home to them in this way, the gravity of the situation.

Therefore, I say, with all my heart I do approve the conduct and act of the President in directing our ambassador to come home and in sending their ambassador home, so that the Government of that country may understand how important this question is to us, and how serious the situation is to us, and to them.

Now, Mr. President, just one word more and my part in this discussion is over. I would seriously regret to see any considerable number of Senators in this Chamber, on either side of it, vote against this resolution, not that I would question their motives, not that I would criticize their conduct, not that their conduct would be misunderstood in this country, but for fear that foreign people and foreign governments that do not understand the American people, that do not understand the American institutions, might misinterpret and misread the situation here if it went out to the world that on this issue, thrust in this body unwisely, I believe, but nevertheless here, there was a considerable division in sentiment among the Members of the American Senate, it might do a vast deal of harm in other countries; it might defeat the very object of the President of the

United States and nullify his attempt to emphasize the gravity of this situation and apprise the German Government of the serious condition of public sentiment here on this question.

So I earnestly hope that no considerable number of Senators will vote against the resolution, since it is here and we must vote one way or the other. If they do, I earnestly hope that their position may not be misapprehended abroad because, Mr. President, I believe, and every Senator on both sides of this Chamber must believe, yea, must know, that there is no real division of opinion or sentiment among the American people on this great question or in this great crisis. We do not want to fight about English rights or French rights or German rights; but, Mr. President, if we must fight for American rights, if they can be secured in no other way on earth except by fighting for them, I think the nations of the earth are destined to discover that there will be no real division of opinion among the American people on that issue. If any nation on this earth, great or small, in Europe or anywhere else, thinks that the American people will tamely submit to see American citizens butchered and their rights ignored on the high seas or anywhere else, that nation is about to receive a pretty speedy enlightenment as to what is the real temper and sentiment of the American people. There is no division among us. We do not want to fight about technicalities or about whether ships are armed defensively or offensively. We do not want to fight for English rights, but for American rights every citizen of this country will give his life, if need be. We want peace above all things except the honor of this country.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not indulge the hope of adding anything to the discussion that has already taken place, and were it not that against my advice and better judgment I am called upon to vote upon a resolution which I feel has no proper place here I would say nothing at all. If this resolution is introduced as a friendly act to the President or in the interest of the country's peace, then it seems to me that the President and the people should devoutly pray to God for deliverance from their friends, because I can think of nothing that will have a more opposite effect upon those purposes than this resolution and the debate which has followed its introduction. Prior to its presentation here and since the President's address to the two Houses of Congress there had been no expression in the Senate, there has been no opinion expressed in public by Senators antagonistic to the action of the President. Those who may have differed from the President have felt that opposition should not be publicly expressed. Senators have felt that he had acted in his constitutional authority and had not exceeded that authority, and were hoping that good might come from it. They have remained silent, and by their silence at least have given the nations of the world to understand that there was no division in the Congress of the United States or among the people of this country in their loyalty to the President.

But somehow or other some Senators who seem to be in charge of the foreign affairs of the Senate have seen fit to take some peculiar steps. The other day a resolution was introduced asking the Senate to pass upon a matter which was not within its jurisdiction, indorsing the President's efforts for peace. To-day we are asked to indorse an act of the President which presages war. Why any Senator should have conceived it to be his duty to open up this question in the Senate and thus invite discussion is more than I can understand.

I said that I was going to be forced to vote upon this resolution against my better judgment. I know it has no proper place here, and I would have liked to have remained silent both in voice and vote on a question which can not accomplish any good purpose. I urged Senators who were insistent in presenting this resolution to refrain from doing so, because I could foresee, knowing the habit of the Senate in the past, that it would be debated, as it has been debated, and that instead of showing the world that there was harmony here it would be shown that there was a wide difference of opinion among Senators. The result has confirmed my prediction.

I agree, however, with the Senators who have preceded me that when it comes, if it shall come, to action to be taken on the part of the Senate on any matter, however serious, all Senators will be loyal to the Government. Certainly I will. I myself can conceive of no other action that the President could have taken than the one he did take. I have thought many times, and have so expressed myself on several occasions, that our country's conduct of foreign affairs in the past has led up to this fateful hour. It has struck.

Now, instead of allowing the effect to which the junior Senator of Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] so eloquently referred—namely, the effect upon the Imperial Government of Germany by the decla-

ration of the President of the United States in breaking off diplomatic relations—the Senate in a measure at least neutralizes that effect by this protracted debate.

I trust, Mr. President, that if we shall have greater trials or continued trials in the future, this experiment of bringing irrelevant matters to the Senate will not be repeated. The Senate has its duties to perform and I submit it will not shirk from the performance of those duties if the time to perform them shall come, but to ask at this time Senators to indorse a resolution which is read differently by different Senators and which some feel commits them to a policy which upon reflection they might not wish to approve is not dealing justly with them.

Mr. President, I shall support this resolution on the theory that it is to be an expression by the Senate whether the matter is properly here or not indorsing the President of the United States. I do not care to be registered in opposition to the President of the United States in his efforts to protect and maintain the rights and honor of our country. I have my opinion as to who is responsible for the step that has been taken, but it is not proper nor will it serve any good purpose for me to express that opinion now. The step has been taken. The President of the United States is my President; he has spoken for my country and I shall not knowingly give the impression at home or abroad that I am opposed to upholding his hand in these fateful times, reserving to myself, however, the right to determine later if the question is put up to me whether the cause is sufficient for us to declare war upon a nation which through all our history has been friendly to us.

I regret exceedingly that these circumstances have arisen. I would have been glad not out of cowardice but I would have been glad to have avoided a vote on this useless trouble-making resolution. But it is here and with this explanation I shall vote affirmatively, regretting exceedingly that those who have thought it best to present it had not read the inevitable result.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, now that the sapient and pulchritudinous Senator from Michigan has unloaded his tender stomach of overcharged bile I hope he may be given an immediate chance to reluctantly avail himself of the opportunity he seems to dread of speaking by way of a vote. I ask again for a vote.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I have been unable to attend the sessions to-day. I was on committee work all day, from 10 o'clock until about 3, and I have not heard the arguments. I find myself compelled to decide on a question which I have not heard discussed either pro or con.

As far as I am concerned personally, I have felt as a citizen of this country that it was the duty of the Congress and the executive department of the Government to keep the people out of war at this time, except in case of repelling invasion. The war between the warring nations is a horror, the greatest that has ever happened in the history of mankind; it has cost suffering and loss of life and loss of money to a degree that perhaps is almost incalculable. I did not want to participate in it. We are 3,000 miles from where it is being carried on, or more than that, in fact, on the average. We will have plenty to do if we attend to our own business. We should occupy a position of strict neutrality with kindly expression to all and the hope that they may quit the useless slaughter and with an offer to freely help them recover themselves when they do quit, quite regardless of either or any of the nations and without prejudice to any one of them. That has been my state of mind ever since the war began.

I love the English and their bulldog grit. In part they are my ancestors. I always did like them. I think I love the French more than any other of the warring nations. They came to our rescue in a time of our early history, and they are such a light-hearted, loyal, patriotic people that I admire them. I admire the Germans for their efficiency and steady industry, their deep, hard study in solving problems of scientific and economic value to the world, in which matters they have led every other nation. I like all of those people. I have visited in all those countries as a medical student and I made my home in the family boarding houses. There was never a better woman in the world than the English woman with whom you go to board. There is nobody more kind than the good, motherly old French woman who takes you into her house and treats you as she would her own child.

When you go over to Germany the good old hausfrau delights in stuffing you, if she can, with good things to eat, like your own mother did, and then assigns you to sleep between great thick feather mattresses, which smother you almost to death, but always with the kindest intention. No man can visit among any of these people without loving them, respecting them, and being ready to fight to keep them happy and out of the horrors of war. Those are my sentiments and have been at all times. I have commiserated with all of them, and only hope and pray

that we, as an independent Nation outside of their borders, with prosperous conditions, might stay at home and mind our own blessed business. We have plenty to do here, and should keep out of that trouble.

In early days where I came from when a row would spring up among men, and they began shooting at one another, the rule of common sense which was practiced by the people who were not engaged in it was to keep out of it, and nobody who was not a born fool ever rushed in between them to become a backstop for bullets. We always left them to fight it out, and thanked God we were not mixed up in it, and then when the smoke had cleared away we gathered the dead up on a shutter and sent for the doctor for the wounded; we regretted the occurrence and went about our business. At this time we are confronted with a similar condition, where one nation has said to us, "We are at war and you must not trade with such and such a country, and if your ships are loaded with cargoes that will be of value to those people whom we are fighting we will confiscate the cargo and tie your ships up in our docks." Then later along comes the other country and claims that the other enemy nation is trying to starve them, which they are, and they place the same restrictions upon us, and draw a dead line around their enemy's country and declare it to be a danger zone and tabooed.

Any American citizen who would go to Europe and walk down between the trenches where they were firing at one another with their machine guns would be an ass, and would deserve to get just what he would get. I would not fight for him. No; I would not take any chance of being shot at for him. That kind of a citizen is of no value or credit to us; he puts this Nation in peril and does not bring anything of value in return to this country after having been nurtured in it to the age of maturity, an age when he ought in ordinary decency to help keep out of trouble by using a reasonable amount of common sense. So I would say to him when he starts for the war zone, "My dear brother, we bid you farewell; you may go there if you want; you can tramp up and down all your life between the firing lines; but I do not assume any responsibility for your happiness or good health. It is right up to you."

After a nation has fought bravely and well as have the others and for what it considers to be as just a cause and for as high ideals as its enemies, and it should come and say to me that there is a certain zone about my enemies' country inside of which no ship will be permitted to pass with ammunition or food, I would say to him, "Very well, that suits me first-rate. I live more than 3,000 miles away from you and our people at home need all the food we have and more than they get and it looks like we might need our ammunition after a while in order to rehabilitate ourselves from a peace footing to one of reasonable war preparation in the event that some other nation may come to dislike us. It is up to you, gentlemen. I will keep my ships at home."

There is many a family in this country to-day, gentleman, who under the high cost of living, due in part to the war, are not getting quite enough to eat. Right here within five blocks of this building where I am talking, or not to exceed 10 squares, and all over the country there are families that are cutting down on their food supply for lack of money with which to pay for it. Our first duty is to them. Prices of food have gone up so high that no more can they eat the amount which is necessary for their proper nourishment. They are also going short of clothing and shoes, both in quantity and quality, and children begin to suffer here at home, all due in a degree and indirectly to this great and unfortunate conflict which is going on upon the other side of the ocean, and I have no heart in it or for it.

I would say to the people of this country or to the gentlemen who want to ship merchandise and other articles of value for profit for the support of these other people, that our people also need them, and it may be that they need them nearly as badly as do the people over there. In England the price of bread is said to be cheaper than it is in this country for the reason that they have cheaper wheat than we have, because they bought it from us when the market was lower. Our first duty lies here; and our people both need and want bread. They are our people, and they are those of our people who will have to fight if we become entangled in your embroilment. Our first duty is to them.

I would say to those who want to go across the dead line, where there are submarines or Zeppelins that drop bombs, "Go, and God go with you; but go at your own risk. I will not fight to save the merchandise of any such American citizens as you are. Go and get killed if you want to, but we, the people, will not fight for you, or the like of you, or for your cargoes of war supplies."

I have been at sea a little, and although I have never served "before the mast" I will guarantee to the Senate that I can

take a ship out to sea, and if the sinking of that ship will cause war between this country and some other nation I can bring a war home to you and upon this country in 10 days. It would be an easy thing to do, so easy that I fear it will be done by those who would profit from such an incident. We are running a great risk at this time. From motives of selfishness anyone may force this country into a war in a week, if we are going to stand upon our rights to act the fool in any such a manner.

It is the duty of this country, first and now, as it has been its duty for some time in the past, to say to American citizens: "Go yourself or with your ships at your peril; go with the understanding that you are about to cause the loss of thousands of lives of your fellow citizens, who are just as good men as you are, and most of them better, I presume; go if you want to make an excursion into the realms of warfare; but go at your own peril. We will not imperil the happiness and perhaps the very existence of this Nation to fight for such as you." So also to the man who wants to ship for profit I would say: "Do you also go, but at your own peril. I will see you to the 3-mile limit, I will give you a Book of Psalms and a God bless you, and 'a fare ye well to you,' and then watch you fade from view and sink into the horizon, and if you come back, well and good; but if you do not come back I will not grapple either for your body or your cargo. You well know the risk yourself, and you have a right to assume it; but you have no right to push or drag me into your row. The minute you do, you become my enemy, just as much as the foreigners with whom I have no conflict or anything but kindly feeling."

That is where I stand on this question, and where else am I going to stand, not only for myself, but for the people whom I am representing, and whom I believe indorse me in the position which I take here and who have prayed that we be kept out of this war.

So I say, that while I have not had time to be here to listen to this argument, to the argument which might convince me that this is not my proper course to pursue, they are my opinions as one of you, representing a people just as good as any whom you represent, and I am not afraid to express them at any time or any place.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we have professed from the beginning of this war to occupy the position of a neutral Nation and to be interested alone in maintaining the neutral rights of a neutral Nation. It has seemed to me that that was the proper attitude to occupy, and should be the attitude which we should occupy on to the close of this controversy. A South American statesman said at the beginning of this war that the rights of the belligerents at sea should begin where the rights of the neutrals end. That, to my mind, is the correct rule, and the rule which we should have made and should now make every effort to maintain. It is a rule which we should apply and enforce toward all alike.

If I understand the purpose of the President in breaking off diplomatic relations with Germany, it was solely and alone in the interest of our neutral rights, the President believing that, by reason of the record which had been made by Germany, her last note was a direct challenge to those rights, and that his action in severing diplomatic relations was solely in the interest and exclusively for the purpose of maintaining those rights. Believing, as I have from the beginning, that it was our duty to firmly and positively maintain and support those rights as against all who should challenge them, I can not do otherwise, of course, than to vote for this resolution as an indorsement of that which the President believed to be the proper way to maintain those rights.

Mr. President, there is no difficulty upon my part in arriving at that conclusion so far as this particular vote is concerned. What most disturbs me is that in all probability, if the worst should come to the worst, we shall no longer be able to keep the position which we have professed to occupy heretofore, and that we may find ourselves, unless we are most circumspect and resolute, an open and avowed ally of one of the belligerent powers or of one group of the belligerent powers. That, in my judgment, would be the most disastrous thing that could possibly happen to this country. I rise, therefore, not so much to explain my vote in reference to the pending resolution as to throw out a single suggestion in reference to that feature of this unfortunate situation.

I have observed from the press, particularly from interviews in the press both at home and abroad, and from letters and telegrams, that there is the belief that this action is a pronounced step in the direction of engaging in this war, not for the purpose alone of protecting neutral rights, but for the purpose of bringing this war to a close by throwing our weight and our influence upon the side of the allies. I read only yesterday morning a statement by one of the most distinguished publicists

in this country, published in a paper which has perhaps as large a circulation as has any other paper in the country, this statement which I shall quote. After reviewing the action of the President and what probably might be done, the statement says:

Should we not rather try to supplement as best we can the entente-war organizations already in operation? This means placing the Navy under British orders; encouraging foreign enlistments; stimulating the export of war material, above all aiding the enemies of the common foe with our financial resources. In the main, that is what Japan has done. To do otherwise, in my judgment, is to waste our strength.

That view, Mr. President, has found expression not in the Senate Chamber, but by many and some of great influence outside of the Senate Chamber, by people who ought to think along different lines.

It ought to be distinctly understood that we are interested alone in protecting our neutral rights as a neutral Nation, and that what we have done and all that we may do is for that purpose and no other. We are seeking no alliances. We are not consciously or purposely moving to the side of either of the belligerent forces. That is the position we should occupy; it is the position which I shall hold myself free at all times to the extent of my ability to aid in having our Government occupy. What the future has in store no man knows, but I think we ought to brace ourselves against the strong tendency which will now arise to become a partisan in the war. Whatever our individual sympathies may be as citizens we ought not to permit our individual views to direct our Government along other than these lines. I think it not only the position which we should occupy in the interest of our own people and for their peace and happiness but it is the position which we ought to occupy for the ultimate influence which we may hope to exercise in the final adjustment of this conflict. I agree not at all with those who would have this Government take up at once the cause of the allies.

As I understand, the President's sole object and purpose was to maintain and retain the position of a neutral in this controversy and to defend alone neutral rights, and that is the position which I understand him to occupy and to intend to occupy to the conclusion, and upon that understanding I vote for this resolution indorsing his action severing diplomatic relations. I would vote just as quickly to indorse his action in severing diplomatic relations with any power which should put at defiance our undoubted rights as a neutral. If I supposed for a moment that the President was in any instance to be swerved from his attitude heretofore of conducting this Nation along neutral lines, I certainly should under no circumstances give my indorsement to the action which severed our diplomatic relations with Germany.

Mr. President, as I have said, we have professed to be neutral from the beginning. I am not going to discuss now whether or not we have in all instances been neutral, but I want to record my conviction that when we have deviated, if we have deviated at all, from the line of neutrality, we have made a regrettable mistake. If we should in the future, notwithstanding we may have a controversy with one side or the other, fail to occupy that position and to insist upon the maintenance of neutral rights, regardless of who challenges them, and to insist upon our rights under international law regardless of who inveighs against them, we shall have taken a step that the people of this country will not approve and ought not to approve. Let us have our position clearly understood that we have and can have no controversy with either side except for these reasons and purposes.

Mr. President, I appreciate—I hope to some extent at least—the conditions which will be presented to the world at the close of this war. The loss of life in the field and in the hospitals, the broken families, the maimed and impoverished, the depletion of credits, and the destruction of property—even these are not all there is to this war. After that comes the bitterness and the hate, smoldering on through the decades, the demoralization of men's faith in the obligations of treaties, in the ties of international friendship, and even in Christianity itself; for this war is the most pronounced threat to return to barbaric methods and brute force in society and in government since the waves of Islam's fanaticism broke and re-formed and broke again upon the iron nerves and redoubtable valor of Charles Martel's men at Tours. Its deadening, discouraging, disintegrating effect upon all the vital ties and moral ligaments which bind society together, upon all that the human family cherishes and loves, beggars description. But the era of rehabilitation and regeneration, nevertheless, is to come. That long, patient, dreary task is before the world and must be met. I do not want to see my country seek either to ignore the task or to avoid its portion of the burden. I want it to be prompt with its good offices, its counsel, its sympathy, its patience, its tolerance, with its wealth, its means, both spiritual and material, to help in every way to bind up the wounds of the nations and "to do all which

may help to achieve a just and lasting peace." But, sir, I want this and all that it may do to be done as a great neutral Christian nation, drawing from the situation and from the task performed no recompense in the way of promised assistance in the future and incurring no obligation save that which we owe to justice and humanity. I want no alliances, no leagues, no entanglements. I want this Nation to stand alone, except those who voluntarily stand with it, in this crash of nations, firm in its purpose to uphold international law, supporting with all its influence international morality, conserving to the utmost of its powers that influence and prestige which will enable it to serve and counsel in the day of reconciliation and readjustment. What this passion-torn world needs and will need are not more leagues and alliances, but a great untrammelled, courageous neutral power, representing, not bias, not prejudice, not hate, not conflict, but order and law and justice. For these things we have stood for nearly a hundred and fifty years, and our influence has been of incalculable worth to mankind; for these things let us continue to stand, and the time will come in this very world crisis when we may serve all who recognize that our purposes and our policies are just and righteous altogether.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]; but understanding that if present he would vote as I intend to vote, I feel at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], but as this is not a partisan question, though a grave one, I feel at liberty to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness. I agreed to pair with him for the day. I understand, however, that if present he would vote as I am about to vote on this question. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who is absent. I understand that if present he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. POMERENE. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is detained on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] is detained by illness, and that for some four weeks he has been confined to his room and his bed. I make this announcement in order that his absence during the past as well as his absence on this vote may be understood.

Mr. RANDELL. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ASHURST. I rise to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably absent and that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], who is out of the city. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATTON] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—78.

Ashurst	Fernald	Lodge	Polindexter
Beckham	Fletcher	McCumber	Pomerene
Borah	Gallinger	McLean	Ransdell
Brady	Harding	Martin, Va.	Reed
Brandegge	Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Robinson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Myers	Saulsbury
Chamberlain	Hollis	Nelson	Shafroth
Chilton	Hughes	Newlands	Sheppard
Clapp	Husting	Norris	Sherman
Clark	James	Oliver	Shields
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Simmons
Culberson	Jones	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	Kenyon	Page	Smith, Md.
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
du Pont	Lewis	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Fall	Lippitt	Pittman	Smoot

Sterling
Stone
Sutherland
Thomas

Thompson
Tillman
Townsend
Underwood

Wadsworth
Walsh
Warren
Watson

Weeks
Williams

NAYS—5.

Gronna
Kirby

La Follette

Vardaman

Works

NOT VOTING—13.

Bankhead
Broussard
Catron
Dillingham

Goff
Gore
Johnson, Me.
Kern

Lane
Lea, Tenn.
O'Gorman
Smith, Ariz.

Swanson

So Mr. STONE's resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I intended to have taken some part in the discussion upon the resolution which has just been agreed to. Matters transpiring in the debate led me to desire to procure from my committee room certain of the diplomatic correspondence with the belligerent governments, and I had gone to my committee room to secure the documents when the vote was rung in. I desire to say now that at an early date, and upon an occasion quite as pertinent to the issues involved as the resolution which has just been pending I shall say what I expected to say to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has said that the vote was "rung in." The Chair would like to know if the Senator from Wisconsin is making any charge against the Chair?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Why, most assuredly not, Mr. President. There was no occasion, I think, for the Chair or anybody else to understand anything of the kind. I had left the Chamber while one of the Senators was speaking to procure some documents from my room, and while I was absent from the Chamber the vote was rung in. I returned as soon as I could, but, of course, the vote was being taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wants it understood that the Chair has never ordered a vote as long as the Chair has had any information that any Senator wanted to speak. The Chair was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin desired to speak.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Why, of course the Chair was not, because I had not yet addressed the Chair, and there was no occasion for any misunderstanding.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator used the words "rung in." The bell was rung for the vote, and that is what I understand the Senator to mean by the expression.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

PROPOSED EVENING SESSION.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I could not hear what the motion was.

SEVERAL SENATORS. What is the motion? We are unable to hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is totally unable to make Senators take their seats and listen to what is going on in the Senate. The Chair is not the Sergeant at Arms and can not do that. If the Senate will not be in order, the Chair can not help it.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made a little while ago with reference to my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], I withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I transfer my pair as stated to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). Since voting I observe that the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], with whom I am paired, is absent. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe by the recapitulation that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has not voted. I am paired with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Chamberlain
Chilton
Fletcher
Hardwick
Hollis
Hughes

Husting
James
Lee, Md.
Lewis
Martin, Va.
Overman

Owen
Pomerene
Saulsbury
Sheppard
Simmons
Stone

Thompson
Vardaman
Williams

NAYS—47.

Beckham
Borah
Brady
Brandege
Bryan
Clapp
Clark
Cummins
Curtis
du Pont
Fall
Gallinger

Gronna
Harding
Johnson, S. Dak.
Kenyon
Kirby
Lane
Lodge
McCumber
McLean
Martine, N. J.
Nelson
Norris

Oliver
Page
Penrose
Phelan
Pittman
Poindexter
Robinson
Shafroth
Sherman
Shields
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Mich.

Smith, S. C.
Smoot
Sterling
Sutherland
Thomas
Townsend
Underwood
Wadsworth
Warren
Watson
Weeks

NOT VOTING—28.

Ashurst
Bankhead
Broussard
Catron
Colt
Cullerson
Dillingham

Fernald
Goff
Gore
Hitchcock
Johnson, Me.
Jones
Kern

La Follette
Lea, Tenn.
Lippitt
Myers
Newlands
O'Gorman
Ransdell

Reed
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Md.
Swanson
Tillman
Walsh
Works

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by E. T. Taylor, jr., one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 5082. An act adding certain lands to the Missoula National Forest, Mont.;

S. 7779. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss*;

S. 7780. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to *Clemens A. Reiss*;

S. 7781. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss*; and

S. 7782. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss*.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 135) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakan-ton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1061) to allow additional entries under the enlarged homestead act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3699) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5424) to construct a bridge in San Juan County, State of New Mexico, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20453) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11150) for the relief of mail contractors.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 17055. An act providing when patents shall issue to the purchaser or heirs on certain lands in the State of Oregon;

H. R. 17814. An act to transfer Early County from the western division of the northern district of Georgia to the Albany division of the southern district of Georgia; and

H. R. 20082. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, and Mr. LANGLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed in accordance with the resolution of the Senate (S. Con. Res. 30) Mr. RUCKER of Missouri and Mr. MAPES tellers on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 7963. An act to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1917, etc.

ADDITIONAL PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Connecticut State Branch of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to grant the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Manufacturers' Association of Hartford County, Conn., remonstrating against the taxing of net incomes of corporations in excess of 8 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the school committee of the city of New Britain, Conn., praying for Federal aid for vocational education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the faculty of St. George's School, Newport, R. I., favoring the action of the President of the United States in behalf of American rights, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado for the protection and maintenance of the oil industries of the State of Colorado, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Colorado, ss:

CERTIFICATE.

I, James R. Noland, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate concurrent resolution No. 4, by Senator Napier, senate joint memorial for the protection and maintenance of the oil industries of the State of Colorado, which was filed in this office the 3d day of February, A. D. 1917, at 11:18 o'clock a. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado at the city of Denver this 3d day of February, A. D. 1917.

[SEAL.]

JAMES R. NOLAND,
Secretary of State.
By FLOYD FAIRHURST,
Deputy.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 4. (By Senator Napier.)

Senate joint memorial for the protection and maintenance of the oil industries of the State of Colorado.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring), That—

Whereas hundreds of citizens of this State have taken oil-placer claims under the oil-placer mining act and have complied with the law in good faith by doing the assessment work required to hold and develop said claims; and

Whereas in many cases these lands have been located and held by prospectors, who have expended their time and money for many years in trying to hold and develop these oil-placer claims until the conditions and demand for the product would make it possible to operate the same; and

Whereas these lands were located and held under the only law that made it possible for the prospector for oil or gas to acquire the same; and

Whereas these locations were made in good faith and held by the locators before any withdrawal of said lands was made or even contemplated by the Government; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill known as the Ferris-Phelan bill, H. R. 406, providing for the leasing of all oil and gas lands on the public domain; and

Whereas lands which have not been withdrawn are affected by said leasing bill in such a way as to jeopardize existing claims of present bona fide locators: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend said leasing bill to give to all locators and assigns who have held the land in good faith and have complied with the oil-placer mining law the preferential right to lease the same on the same terms that may be required from any other applicant, and claims of original locators or assigns having perfected discoveries under the oil-placer mining law as recognized by State courts to be exempt from being compelled to lease such lands from the Government or pay a royalty burden: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS, Hon. JOHN F. SHAFROTH, Hon. ED. T. TAYLOR, Hon. EDWARD KEATING, Hon. BEN HILLIARD, and the Hon. C. B. TIMBERLAKE, asking their aid in carrying out the object of this resolution.

Approved by the governor February 2, 1917, at 5:05 p. m.

JULIUS C. GUNTER,
Governor of the State of Colorado.
JAS. A. PULLIAM,
President of the Senate.
BOON BEST,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 1, 1917, at 11:30 a. m.

[Indorsed.]

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 3d day of February, A. D. 1917, at 11:18 o'clock a. m. Recorded in book —, page —.

JAMES R. NOLAND,
Secretary of State.
By FLOYD FAIRHURST,
Deputy.
HUMPHREY FEES,
Filing Clerk.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I present a telegram from citizens of Jackson, Miss., relative to the pending emergency revenue bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

JACKSON, MISS., February 6, 1917.

Hon. J. K. VARDAMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

The proposed Federal emergency revenue measure ignores fact that mutual life insurance companies are without capital stock and are not operated for profit, but grant insurance protection to policyholders at lowest net cost. We ask your cooperation in exempting mutual life insurance companies from provisions of pending bill.

E. L. Ragland, J. B. Stirling, J. M. Hartfield, R. M. Taylor, W. H. Watkins, H. V. Watkins, Wade Humphreys, Z. D. Davis, W. E. Mallett, D. B. Homes, C. O. Wilkens, E. H. Bradshaw, George C. Swearingen, A. Varden, A. Robert Mills, E. K. Middleton, and others.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota remonstrating against the proposed increase of tax on industrial insurance, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7906) to authorize the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George L. Morrison captain of Cavalry, to take rank as such next after Capt. James A. Mars, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1012) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon:

S. 6638. A bill for the relief of James S. Huntington; and
S. 7071. A bill for the relief of William M. Johnston.

RELIEF OF RUTHENIANS.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 201) requesting the President of the United States to designate and appoint a day on which funds may be raised for the relief of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians), and I submit a report (No. 1013) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read as follows:

Requesting the President of the United States to designate and appoint a day on which funds may be raised for the relief of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians).

Whereas in the countries situated in the eastern part of Europe, the theater of devastating war, there are at least 1,000,000 of Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in dire need of food, clothing, and shelter; and Whereas hundreds of thousands of these people have been forced to abandon their homes and their property, and being deprived of all opportunity to provide even for their most elementary wants have undergone disease, starvation, and indescribable suffering; and

Whereas the people of the United States of America have learned with sorrow of this terrible plight of great numbers of their fellow beings and have most generously responded to the appeal of humanity for assistance whenever such appeal has reached them: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in view of the wretchedness, misery, and privation which these people are enduring, the President of the United States be respectfully requested to designate and appoint a day on which the citizens of this country may give expression to their sympathy by contributing to the funds now being raised for the relief of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in the belligerent countries.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 8162) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Dayton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8163) granting an increase of pension to Amos Dickinson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8164) granting an increase of pension to Robert Liddell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 8165) to prohibit concerted control of fire insurance rates in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 8166) granting an increase of pension to Malinda K. McGowen (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8167) granting an increase of pension to Phebe T. Schonhoff (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 8168) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States, with its Territories and possessions, and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 8169) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Fredericktown, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 8170) to provide for the cost of improving and completing the United States post office and courthouse at Guthrie, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 8171) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Coffman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 8172) granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. H. Feather (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) to grant citizenship to Joseph Beech; to the Committee on Immigration.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to estab-

lish and maintain horticultural experiment stations in the Mississippi Valley, to be located in the principal grape-growing States of Missouri, Ohio, Arkansas, and Michigan, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint and place on the retired list of the Army with the rank of major general any officer on the retired list who served not less than one year in the Regular or Volunteer forces of the United States during the Civil War prior to April 9, 1865, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions.

On February 3, 1917:

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 5, 1917.

On February 6, 1917:

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1917;

S. 7537. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.; and

S. 8090. An act granting the consent of Congress to Washington-Newport News Short Line, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River.

COMMISSION ON NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, report No. 2 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations.

The attention of the Congress is especially called to the request and recommendation that certain portions of the report and appendices should not be made public.

WOODROW WILSON.

The WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1917.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the report accompanying the message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs in confidence and without printing.

ANNUITIES TO SIOUX INDIANS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 135) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863.

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the bill and amendment, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ASHURST, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. CLAPP conferees on the part of the Senate.

LAND AT ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3699) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot, which was, on page 2, line 3, after "purposes," to insert "or whenever the Secretary of War may determine that the use of said grounds is necessary for Government purposes."

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ENLARGED HOMESTEAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1061) to allow additional entries under the enlarged homestead act, which was, on page 1, line 8, after "nine," to insert "and an

act of June 17, 1910, entitled 'An act to provide for an enlarged homestead.'

Mr. PITTMAN. I am informed that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] desires that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House, and I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HUGHES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I rise to an inquiry. What do "and so forth," as the Clerk reads the report from the House of Representatives, and the constantly recurring phraseology "with certain amendments" mean? I think the Senate is entitled to have these messages read at length, and I object, and many other Senators, I want to say, on this side of the Chamber object, and I voice an undercurrent of criticism of the liberties taken at the desk with messages and other communications. I hope hereafter the procedure will be orderly and regular, and that messages will be read without comment from the clerks or without interpolation of phraseology not contained in the documents.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 17055. An act providing when patents shall issue to the purchaser or heirs on certain lands in the State of Oregon was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 17814. An act to transfer Early County from the western division of the northern district of Georgia to the Albany division of the southern district of Georgia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 20082. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the unfinished business be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask the Secretary to state the amendment which was pending when the bill was laid aside yesterday. I think it was the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. BRADY. On page 63, line 6, I wish to offer the following amendment:

Provided, That in the sale or rental of films educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit shall have preference.

I may say that the original clause—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest that the Secretary read the amendment. We could not hear the Senator as he read it.

Mr. BRADY. I will be glad to have the Secretary read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, line 6, after the word "films," at the end of the line insert:

Provided, That in the sale or rental of films educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit shall have preference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment of the committee?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from Idaho state the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. BRADY. The original paragraph reads as follows:

For photographic equipment and photographic material and artists' tools and supplies, \$17,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, under such rules and regulations and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to loan, rent, or sell copies of films to educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit.

The committee decided to strike out after the word "films," in line 6, the words "to educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit," so that it would permit them to sell them only to outside firms. I believe that is a wise provision, with the exception that I am satisfied educational institutions organized for agricultural purposes should have preference. It does not prevent the sale to other institutions or firms at all.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment. I have overlooked the fact that there is a committee amendment which has not yet been disposed of. It is the seed-distribution proposition. I should like to have it now disposed of and that will be a disposition of all the committee amendments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. PAGE. I do not yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina, before we recur to the committee amendments, which, of course, he has a right to do, to allow me to offer an amendment as I am obliged to leave the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I hope the Senator will allow me to offer my amendment now. It is very brief, indeed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, after the word "purposes," the first word in line 7, insert a comma and the words:

And \$15,000 for the purchase of lands in the vicinity of the Morgan horse farm near Middlebury, Vt.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, when this amendment was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry one of our members stated he thought this would be a new and dangerous innovation, a precedent which we ought not to establish because he said the additions to experiment stations in the different States had usually been paid for by the States themselves. Upon investigation I found that this is a mistake, that there are numerous precedents for action of this kind. I wrote to the department asking for a statement in regard to the matter and here is their reply which I wish to read:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1917.

HON. CARROLL S. PAGE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PAGE: Referring to your request to Mr. Rommel by telephone this morning for information concerning the purchase of land for the benefit of this bureau for experimental or quarantine purposes, permit me to give you the following information:

Experiment Station, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bethesda, Md.: This is the station where the principal part of the veterinary experimental work with animals is carried on. The original farm of 20 acres was bought July 5, 1899, at a cost of \$20,000. An additional 30 acres was bought August 11, 1902, at a cost of \$10,000. In view of the fact that it was found necessary to have similar facilities for carrying on field laboratory experiments and investigations in animal husbandry and dairying near Washington, Congress was petitioned to appropriate for the purchase of additional land, and under congressional authority the department bought the experimental farm of the Bureau of Animal Industry near Beltsville, Prince Georges County, Md. This consists of 475 acres. It was bought January 30, 1910, at a cost of \$25,000.

The bureau maintains three quarantine stations on the Atlantic seaboard, all bought under congressional authority. The appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1901 authorized the expenditure of \$50,000 to purchase and maintain quarantine stations. Under this authority the quarantine station at Athenia, N. J., was established. In 1904 \$4,000 was made available for the purchase of additional land at Athenia. The total acreage there is now 50 acres.

In the same year Congress appropriated \$10,000 for the purchase of land for a quarantine station of the bureau at or near the port of Baltimore. Under this authority the quarantine station at Turner, Md., was established.

In 1909, under congressional authority, the bureau purchased 31 acres of land at Littleton, Mass., near the port of Boston, at a cost of \$4,000. Trusting that this is the information which you wish, I am,

Very truly, yours,

A. D. MELVIN,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will allow me, I find that that amount has been estimated for. As far as I am concerned I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. PAGE. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from South Carolina will allow me, I should like to offer at this time an amendment on page 69, after the word "elsewhere," in line 9, to insert "demonstration of boys' and girls' clubs at dairy exposition at Springfield, Mass.," and then, on line 10, to change the total amount from "\$578,240" to "\$593,240," adding \$15,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I shall have to make a point of order against the amendment in that it is new matter and has not been estimated for.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I am sorry the Senator from South Carolina feels bound to make a point of order, but I am aware that if it is made I am unable to resist it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is an appropriation not estimated for and not reported by a standing committee, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to submit an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will ask the Senator to withhold that until we dispose of the last two committee amendments. One was pending at the time the Senate took a recess yesterday. I ask that it be taken up and disposed of. It is on page 27, "Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds." The House adopted the provision and sent it here, and, as I said when the matter was under consideration yesterday, I was not present when the committee took action upon it. It is not necessary for me to repeat what I said yesterday. I believe that this is one of the most important items in the bill. There are right now requisitions from all over the country, especially from that part of the country where droughts occurred during the last year to such an extent as to destroy all seed locally. I wish to say a few words as to this talk about its being a graft, and then I shall have no more to say and let the Senate take what action it sees fit.

The people of this country understand that this is the policy of the Government, and it makes no difference who may be elected to the other House or to the Senate, that this policy will be adhered to, and that they will receive whatever seed the Government has for distribution in the natural order of things. I do not believe that there is a more helpful provision in all this bill than the Government distribution of garden, field, and flower seed. There is not a single institution of learning in the rural districts of which I know in my State that is not asking for flower seed, thereby beautifying the landscape and cultivating the æsthetic taste of the children by the planting of such seed, and in a thousand little gardens the people are using the seed to benefit themselves. I hope the Senate will restore this item.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee if he is speaking only for himself in this request and not for the committee?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am speaking only for myself, as I said at the commencement of my remarks. I was not present, as the Senator from Iowa, who is a member of the committee, knows. Had I been present, I should have reserved the right that I am now taking to object to the action of the committee. I do not want the Senate even to feel that in my position as acting chairman of the committee I am carrying any other weight on the committee save my personal opinion about this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before saying a word in opposition to the amendment of the committee, I am going to take the liberty to sound a warning to both sides of the Chamber regarding the present status of the legislation of this session.

The pending appropriation bill has been before the Senate a long time and there are 11 great appropriation bills not yet reported to the Senate. The District of Columbia appropriation bill is ready for presentation, the other great appropriation bills are coming along rapidly, and the revenue bill has yet to be considered. My admonition is—it is not worth much, I understand, but I am going to take the liberty of saying a word along that line notwithstanding—my admonition is that unless we get down to work and throw aside all extraneous matters, including contests over nominations, we are not going to complete the program of even passing the supply bills between now and the 4th day of March. There are only 21 or 22 days remaining to us, and Senators know how rapidly the days pass when we are engaged in controversial matters.

While I have no responsibility at all in this matter, I speak to my associates on this side of the Chamber as well as to my friends on the other side when I say that there is danger that even the supply bills will not be passed by the time this session concludes.

Now, Mr. President, a single word as to the pending amendment. I am not going to argue it at any considerable length. I have said every year when this matter has been before the Senate that I think it a very great mistake for the Senate to strike out this appropriation. I concur in every word that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has said as to the value of this appropriation to the people of this country. I am now sending the seeds that are accredited to me to institutions of learning in New Hampshire, largely to the high schools and the graded schools. I am getting letters so numerous along

that line that I shall not be able perhaps to fill all of the requisitions. In addition to that I have sent a very large number of seeds to individual men and women who have written me asking for them.

I will repeat what I have said on more than one occasion, that this is a matter that can be laughed at, or scorned perhaps, but nevertheless if Senators living in rural districts or having little homes in rural towns, as I chance to have, will take the trouble to inquire of the farmers as to whether or not they are having better gardens, or as to whether or not they are having gardens under this distribution of seeds when they would not have any gardens unless these seeds were sent to them, they will find what I have found, that a tremendous amount of good comes to the people of the rural districts because of this comparatively small expenditure.

This day, Mr. President, of high prices, of scarcity of food products, when every foot of land in this country that can be tilled ought to be tilled, when every available vacant lot in every town and city ought to be cultivated for the purpose of increasing the food supply of the American people, is a bad time for us to deny to the farmers, as well as to those living in urban communities, this little patrimony of the Government.

Mr. President, it is a foregone conclusion that the people want this thing; that the people ask for it; and even if the Senate strikes out the provision, I think I can safely indulge in the prophecy that it will reappear in this bill, and that it will become a law. But, however that may be, we ought not to strike it from the bill.

Mr. President, having warned the Senate of the value of time, I am not going to be guilty myself of occupying any unnecessary time in discussing this question. I shall content myself with voting against the committee amendment, and I trust the Senate will vote the committee amendment down.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to indorse what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has said with reference to the value placed upon these seeds by the country people. I want also to express my agreement with the Senator with reference to his comments upon the necessity of economizing time. A number of supply bills will be here for consideration in a very short while, and they are going to carry enormous sums. When we realize the fact that the heaviest part of the burden to be put upon the American people by the appropriations carried in those bills will fall upon the people—the farmers—who are given this slight benefaction, I do not think that Congress ought to hesitate to restore this provision of the bill, which was placed there by the House of Representatives. The people pay the taxes and they want the seed, if I am to judge by the letters I receive from the people and the applications that come to my office for these seeds.

I have heard it said in derision here on the floor of the Senate that Senators have received letters from constituents who say, "Cut out free seeds." I myself have received one or two such foolish letters; but if the Agricultural Department is doing its duty, it is selecting and distributing among the people the very best seeds obtainable, seeds that have been tested, seeds that have been developed, and which will bring, when planted and properly cultivated, the largest possible yield from the land.

I do not see why this matter should be a subject of controversy every year. I can account for it upon one theory, and one only, and that is lack of information or, perhaps, misinformation on the subject. It may be that the constituents of a few Senators and Representatives from the urban districts have no use for the seeds, but I know, from actual experience and observation, that the people of my State desire them, and I hope that the amendment of the committee may be rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment of the committee will not be defeated. I do not intend to indulge in any sharp epithets with respect to the practice of distributing seeds or to use any harsh language or any particular amount of ridicule directed toward the custom.

I have been interested in hearing what Senators have said upon the floor as to the great desire of the farmers of this country to have these seeds given to them. Permit me to say that I myself live in the heart of a farming district, every one of my neighbors being an agriculturist, and it has yet to come to my attention that there is any great and legitimate demand for a package of garden seeds from the average farmer of the United States. At best these seeds must be distributed over such an enormous area and to such a vast number of people, if the thing is to be done fairly, as to prevent any one person on the list of recipients of seeds deriving any benefit worthy of the name. At most, if they are distributed evenly and fairly, it would amount to about one package apiece, worth approximately 5 cents.

Now, Mr. President, so far as the argument is directed toward the rarity and value of these seeds, permit me to say that they are not rare or valuable in any sense whatsoever. They are seeds in common use all over the country in a commercial sense. The Government itself purchases the seeds from contractors or on contract with commercial seedsmen. There is nothing strange or new in the manner of planting them or growing them. There has grown up from the custom without doubt in some communities a disposition to regard this distribution of seeds as the extension of a favor, showing that the recipient is not forgotten at the seat of government; but to contend that they are of the slightest economic value to the development of agriculture in the United States is stretching the matter so far that I can not command words to describe it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator realize that there is great force in the argument made here to-day that it is necessary to have these seeds in order to decorate the country schoolhouses with lilacs, sunflowers, and forget-me-nots?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suppose, if we confined the distribution of seeds to the country schoolhouses and other educational institutions, and made the distribution evenly and thoroughly, that the country schoolhouse or educational institution would receive about 25 cents' worth of seeds annually.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I do not want to be misrepresented about this matter. I presume my remarks are what called forth the interrogatory on the part of the Senator from Iowa, but what I said was that there was a demand on the part of educational institutions in my State—high schools and, to some extent, graded schools and academies—for these seeds; that the children were taking the seeds and planting them, and in that way developing a love for that kind of work, which is desirable, besides making some contribution to the food supply of our people. That is what I said, and it is true, so far as New Hampshire is concerned. I can not speak for Iowa or for New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course I have the greatest respect for the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I do think, in all frankness, that it is stretching pretty far to argue that the distribution of these seeds contributes to the food supply of the United States. It is impossible, in my judgment, that that should be so. It may be that in some States the matter is taken seriously, but certainly in the agricultural regions with which I am somewhat familiar—and I have spent my life in one—the distribution of these seeds is regarded as somewhat in the nature of a joke. I have seen in the home office of a Representative sack after sack filled with packages of seeds, with the open notice and advertisement to the entire community that anybody who wished to come in and get a package could do so at his leisure and pleasure; and at the end of the planting season three-quarters of them were left. In that section the people really do not desire them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator inform the Senate as to the locality where, as he states, the seeds are not asked for, because I assure the Senator that the seeds can be used in other parts of the country, where the people will be very glad to receive them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In reply to the Senator from Utah, I will say that, so far as my observation goes, the farmers of western New York are not clamoring for these free seeds; and the instance which I have related occurred in that part of the country, which is as typical and as purely an agricultural section as exists anywhere upon this continent.

I know that the indiscriminate distribution of any article of value for nothing necessarily excites the appetite of the recipient, and in the district or the State which is flooded with any article which is given away for nothing, particularly if it comes from the seat of government, you will find the demand for that article is increased. Small as the cost is, comparatively speaking, of this distribution, I think myself that there is a fundamental error and fallacy back of it and under it.

I have opposed, Mr. President, as I shall always oppose, the distribution of any article or articles of value to citizens of the Republic free of charge. It is demoralizing in its effects, and it is not the function of the Government to engage in such operations. One might just as well say that, in order to be fair with the distribution of things of value to the people of the United States, we should send pairs of shoes to urban residents. They are of value and would be appreciated if received, but my observation teaches me, sir, that the average independent, self-respecting farmer does not demand this gratuity, small though it may be, from this great Government, and that if it is once

abolished, if the practice is once given up, we will never hear again any considerable demand for its renewal.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if he has noticed that one house of the Legislature of Nebraska, which is an agricultural State, has passed a resolution requesting Congress to desist from this practice?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I listened with great interest to the reading of such a resolution at the Secretary's desk some days ago. I believe there was also such a resolution from the Legislature of North Dakota. I will inquire of the Senator from North Dakota if I am correct as to that?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was indicative, at least, that a legislature, composed in large part of representative American farmers, places no faith or reliance in this practice, and has no particular affection for it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I dislike very much to oppose anything of which the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is in favor, but the committee saw proper to strike out this provision from the bill. Furthermore, Mr. President, it has been stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that I had presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the legislative assembly of my State, protesting against the distribution of free seeds. I do not claim that that represents the will of all the people of my State. I take it that it is impossible for the members of that assembly to know the desire and the will of all the citizens of the State. I wish to say that I have received many requests from my constituents for free seeds, and, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I also have received a great many requests from various schools in the State asking for seeds, but the legislative assembly of my State say that they are not only opposed to the free distribution of seeds, but that they are opposed to it for the reason that it is a burden upon the Government in that the distribution of the seeds is carried on by mail, and aggregates, I presume, hundreds of tons. Instead of transporting this class of goods by freight, as ought to be done, the seeds are being shipped through the mails.

It was also urged in that concurrent resolution that the seeds are sent out just at the time when the mails of the country are being weighed, and that the railroad companies are getting an undue advantage, largely from the distribution of the seeds, as well as from the distribution of various periodicals and pamphlets which are being sent out by the Members of Congress.

As I said in the beginning, I am sorry that I have to oppose this provision; but I feel that I am in duty bound to respect the wishes of the people of my State and to vote against it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment will not be adopted. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has stated that this is a free distribution and that no good comes from it. I believe that great good comes from the distribution even of common seed. There is an evolution going on in nature, by which the planting of seed, even common seed, in different portions of the United States and under different conditions, in different soils and where irrigation exists, sometimes produces a wonderful result. There is no better illustration of that than the Rocky Ford melon, which evidently was a product of a common seed that was planted in very favorable soil, and which grew and has been cultivated and has developed a most wonderful melon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if the Rocky Ford melon is an outgrowth of free seed delivered by the Government?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, we do not know. It is the general distribution that does it. We take these packages and send them all over the United States, having cantaloupe seeds in them. It may have been; I can not tell, but it is evidently the fact that they are scattered over the United States that produces such results. As a matter of fact, take the development of any of the fruits: We know that the peach tree was nothing but a little weed, almost, the fruit of which was bitter, and which by cultivation and development has produced over 500 varieties.

We know that the apple tree came from the original crab tree, and the result was that by cultivation they have produced over 3,800 varieties of apples. Now, when such possibilities exist, it seems to me it is perfectly proper that we should send from one part of the United States to another part of the United States these seeds for the purpose of trying the soil, trying the climate, and trying the conditions under which they might pro-

duce better results. I feel, inasmuch as the expenditure is not a very large one, that the result would justify the expenditure on the part of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and transferring it to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], I vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the call of the roll long enough to ask the Chair to announce that a vote in the negative is in favor of the distribution of seed? Senators do not seem to understand it.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as last stated, to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. STONE. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. Has the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. FALL. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will allow my vote to stand.

The roll call resulted—yeas 21, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Brady	Harding	Oliver	Thompson
Brandagee	Hughes	Page	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Sherman	
Fletcher	Lodge	Sutherland	
Gronna	Norris	Thomas	

NAYS—26.

Bankhead	Overman	Shafroth	Tillman
Gallinger	Owen	Simmons	Underwood
Hustling	Penrose	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman
James	Phelan	Smith, Md.	Warren
Kirby	PoinDEXTER	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Martin, Va.	Robinson	Smoot	
Myers	Saulsbury	Stone	

NOT VOTING—49.

Ashurst	du Pont	Lea, Tenn.	Reed
Beckham	Fall	Lee, Md.	Shields
Borah	Fernald	Lewis	Smith, Ariz.
Broussard	Goff	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Gore	McCumber	Sterling
Catron	Hardwick	McLean	Swanson
Chilton	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Walsh
Clapp	Hollis	Nelson	Watson
Clark	Johnson, Me.	Newlands	Weeks
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Gorman	Works
Culberson	Jones	Pittman	
Curtis	Kern	Pomerene	
Dillingham	La Follette	Ransdell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the committee amendment the yeas are 21, the nays are 26, Senators JONES and FALL being in the Chamber paired but not voting. The committee amendment is rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, on page—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have not yet been disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We have one other committee amendment, and then we will be through.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood that this was the last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over was passed over at the request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], on page 16, line 20, where the committee proposes to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,700" in the case of "one executive assistant in seed distribution."

Mr. GALLINGER. What page is that, Mr. President?

The SECRETARY. Page 16, line 20.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to state that the committee agreed, when the vote was taken on the first of these increases, that they would not insist on any of the others.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggested that the amendment ought to be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is one other committee amendment, on page 66, line 8. I will have the Secretary state it. He might also read the explanation which accompanies it.

The SECRETARY. On page 66, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$122,500" and to insert "\$137,500."

The memorandum accompanying the amendment is as follows:

Owing to the continued advance in price, it is urgently essential that additional funds be provided for the purchase of coal during the next fiscal year. The contract price for the current year is \$3.46 per ton, and the annual consumption of the department is about 7,500 tons. The open-market price for bituminous coal in Washington at this time is approximately \$5 per ton higher than the present contract price. The General Supply Committee recently opened bids for 250 tons of bituminous coal for the new building of the Department of Justice. The only bid received, which was rejected, was \$8.75 per ton for run-of-mine coal. The District government also recently advertised for bids for 1,000 tons of bituminous coal, and the award was made at the lowest price offered—\$8.90 per ton. The central heating plant of the department supplies not only the majority of the buildings owned and rented in the vicinity of the main building, but also the greenhouses, shops, and stables. In addition, it furnishes electric current for light and for the operation of elevators and a great variety of experimental machinery. If the department is unable to purchase the necessary coal, the power plant, of course, could not be operated. This would mean not only the closing of offices for lack of heat, but the probable destruction of valuable plants in the greenhouses and the loss of experimental work dependent upon electrically driven machinery. In view of these circumstances it is urgent that additional funds be provided to meet a possible advance in the contract price of coal during the next fiscal year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the Senate will agree that on account of the rise in the price of coal and other kinds of fuel and other things that are needed and have not been contracted for this increase should be allowed, because it is essential to keep these matters in operation.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of objecting; but I should like to ask whether the committee have considered the feasibility of opening up the great coal lands of the West as a method of reducing the price of coal to the users here in the East?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state to the Senator from New Mexico that I will join with him, under the proper form of bill, to bring about any condition that will help lower the cost of the necessities of life.

Mr. FALL. Would the Senator, for the committee, agree to an amendment now instructing the Secretary of the Interior to restore to the public domain, under the coal-land law as it exists

now, the withdrawals of 6,000,000 acres of coal lands in the State of New Mexico?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should be very happy to do that on the proper bill; but this bill happens to deal with the Secretary of Agriculture, and that amendment would not properly apply to its provisions.

Mr. FALL. Then would the Senator agree to an amendment directing the Secretary of Agriculture, who has charge of the forest reserves, to open up the coal lands on the forest reserves to coal-land entry?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as a matter of course, as I have already stated to the Senator, I would do anything that would look toward ultimately lowering the price of the necessities of life.

Mr. FALL. Do I understand that the Senator would accept an amendment of that character?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It has not been sufficiently considered for me to commit myself to it. I should have to know the merits of it. In the case of the amendment that is pending, its merits are easily seen.

Mr. FALL. Then, Mr. President, may I ask, if the Senator will permit me, that this item may be passed temporarily, so that I may prepare an amendment to-morrow morning covering the matter?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state to the Senator that that really would not avail, because it would be subject to a point of order, being new legislation on this bill.

Mr. FALL. Of course, if any Senator would make the point of order to prevent a reduction in the price of coal to the consumer there is no object in my offering it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHELAN. I submit an amendment. Is the acting chairman through with the committee amendments?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is a correction that ought to be made.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from California yield to me to call attention to a committee amendment?

Mr. PHELAN. If I have the floor I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before other amendments are offered, this is the very last committee amendment, and it is in the nature of a correction. An addition was made to the bill yesterday to provide for rust and smut in wheat in the western country. That will necessitate, on page 23, line 7, striking out "20" and inserting "30," so as to make the total conform to the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, line 7, strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu "\$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. Does the Senator from Utah desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to inquire about a committee amendment.

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to have my amendment read.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I supposed it was desirable to dispose of the committee amendments first, and I should like to have one committee amendment reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator wishes to make some inquiry in reference to a committee amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On page 81 of the bill I find inserted by the Senate the following committee amendment:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Department of Agriculture by the sections of this act relating to the Bureau of Markets, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, subpoena witnesses, and compel the production of books and papers.

I do not understand upon what theory we can confer upon an administrative officer of the Government the power to compel the production of books and papers. The only way that it could be compelled of course, if the person from whom the production was sought declined to produce them, would be by a proceeding for contempt. I do not think it has hitherto been doubted that such power could not be conferred upon administrative officers.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. This was submitted to the committee by a member of the committee on the ground that in the enforcement of the law in order to get the proper information to correct certain evils that were complained of by truck growers, fruit growers, and those who ship agricultural products in that form, and in order to enable them to ex-

peditionously do this, this language should be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from South Carolina think that we can confer upon the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture the power to compel the production of books and papers?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So far as the legal principle involved is concerned, I do not know that it was discussed in the committee at all. It was placed simply on the ground that this would entail a considerable delay and loss of time unless they were empowered to act, and also there was the matter of expense. As to the right of Congress to do it, that is another question entirely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should have no objection to providing that the Secretary could administer oaths; that he might examine witnesses, and that he might request the production of books and papers.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I accept that amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I certainly would not agree, if I could help it, to any proposition that will permit—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator offer that amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do offer it. I move that the vote by which the amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Secretary ought to have the power to call for books. It may be that he ought to cite them before a court for a violation of an order that he might make and have a contempt proceeding, but there ought to be some provision by which the books can be examined. It is said that enormous profits are being made by middle men, and there ought to be an investigation in regard to it. There ought to be not only power to administer oaths but there ought to be some power lodged somewhere to compel the production of books or else the investigation will be of no avail.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will be a perfectly simple proposition. We can authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to examine witnesses and request the production of books and papers. Then we can authorize, if we desire to do so, the Secretary of Agriculture to apply to the court to compel the production, but we can not authorize him to compel the production. I suggest that amendment. I offer it for the purpose of letting the matter go into conference where it can be arranged.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah that to "call" for the production of books is better than to "request" the production of books.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote whereby the amendment of the committee was agreed to is, without objection, reconsidered; and the Senator from Utah offers an amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 10, before the word "witness," strike out "subpoena" and insert the word "examine," and, in line 11, strike out the word "compel" and insert the words "call for," so that it will read:

The Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection to it in that form.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask that my amendment be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 82, after line 11, insert the following:

For the purchase, preparation, and irrigation of not to exceed 150 acres of land at Chico, Butte County, Cal., the same to be an additional to the existing 80 acres now used as a plant-introduction field station, \$55,000.

Mr. PHELAN. That is a recommendation of the department and has been estimated for. I believe it is not objectionable to the chairman of the committee. If there is any question about it, I am prepared to answer any question that may be raised.

Mr. SMOOT. Did I understand the Senator to say that it was estimated for?

Mr. PHELAN. It was estimated for by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And recommended by the department.

Mr. SMOOT. It was before the committee and the committee refused to put it on the bill?

Mr. PHELAN. I may say it was not heard before the committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from California did not appear before the committee. The committee had the estimate and it was recommended by the department.

Mr. SMOOT. The House had the estimate also and considered it. I do not see why it ought to go in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. I send to the desk the following amendment to be inserted on page 68, after line 8.

The SECRETARY. On page 68, after line 8, insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain horticultural experimental stations in the Mississippi Valley to be located in the principal grape-growing States of Missouri and Ohio, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, \$30,000, as follows: Missouri, \$15,000; Ohio, \$15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the horticultural experimental stations in Missouri and Ohio.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask whether this was estimated for?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It was not.

Mr. SMOOT. And it was not reported by a standing committee?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I make a point of order against it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, just a word. There are now 17 of these stations in California. There is one in New Jersey. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture, because of the present financial conditions, did not feel like recommending the expenditure at this time. This has become a pretty serious proposition in these grape-growing States, and I feel that the amendment ought to be inserted in the bill. I hope the Senator from Utah will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the amendment the Senator from Ohio proposes was offered in the Senate and referred to the committee. For some unexplained, I think unexplainable, reason the committee did not act upon it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me, the committee referred it to the Department of Agriculture. Of course, they had to have more or less dependence on the department and the statement of the department I have before me. The committee was governed largely by the statement of the department. The Secretary of Agriculture wrote as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 29, 1917.

Hon. T. P. GORE,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Receipt is acknowledged of Mr. Thompson's letters of January 26, 1917, requesting a report on the amendments proposed by Senators STONE and POMERENE to the Agricultural appropriation bill providing \$50,000 for establishing and maintaining horticultural experiment stations in the principal grape-growing States of Missouri, Ohio, Arkansas, and Michigan. The amendment proposed by Senator POMERENE authorizes the sale of such products as are obtained on the land of the proposed stations, but otherwise the two amendments are identical.

The work contemplated by the two amendments does not seem to me to present an emergency and, in view of the present financial situation and of the large deficit which must be met, I do not feel justified in recommending that an appropriation be made for the purpose at this time.

Very truly yours,

D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

Mr. STONE. They have these stations in California and in other States.

Mr. POMERENE. There are 17 of these stations in California.

Mr. STONE. Seventeen of them, and none in these four States, all of which are large producers of grapes. If they are important in the States where they are located, they are equally important in these States. Why this discrimination should be indulged in by the honorable committee or by the Secretary of Agriculture I am unable to divine. If the amendment is subject to a point of order, I suppose we shall have to bear the burden of our ills. The Senator from Utah who makes the point of order was offering an amendment on the floor of the Senate for some thousands of dollars to find out what was the matter with ducks out in Utah. None of us made any effort to defeat him in his laudable ambition to take care of those winged fruits of the land. I do not see why he should undertake to deprive us at least of an opportunity of testing the sense of the Senate as to whether Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, and Arkansas should be treated upon terms of equality with other States in like cases.

Mr. SMOOT. The statement of the Secretary of Agriculture has just been read.

Mr. STONE. On account of the deficit is the chief reason, the only one; he urges the lack of money.

Mr. SMOOT. There is quite a different situation existing with this item than there was with the amendment I offered a

year ago proposing to appropriate \$5,000 to investigate the diseases of wild ducks. This appropriation will grow every year. However, if the acting chairman desires to insert this amendment, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I really felt, after I heard the facts, that perhaps when the conferees of the two Houses meet justice may be done. If the Senator will agree to it, I will accept the amendment as far as I am concerned and let the merits of it come before the conference committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. STONE. Just a moment. I have not given up the floor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. All right.

Mr. STONE. I wanted to say that if the scarcity of money is the trouble in the way we could lessen the deficit by abolishing all these stations and by that means put all the States on equal terms. Now, we do not want to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You could bond the Government.

Mr. STONE. Yes; we could do a lot of things.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio provides for \$30,000—\$15,000 for Ohio and \$15,000 for Missouri—whereas the letter from the Department of Agriculture applied to all four States on the basis of \$50,000, an expenditure of \$15,000 for Ohio, \$15,000 for Missouri, and \$10,000 each for Arkansas and Michigan. If you are going to send it into conference it seems to me we ought to pass the proposition in accordance with the recommendation of the department.

Mr. POMERENE. The amendment I originally presented provided for \$50,000—\$15,000 to Ohio, \$10,000 to Michigan, \$15,000 to Missouri, and \$10,000 to Arkansas. Because of the objection made by the department, after a conference with some of the Senators who were interested in the matter—and I intended to speak with the Senator from Michigan on the subject—I thought it might be well to change the appropriation to the form in which I have presented the amendment, for the reason that climatic and soil conditions in Michigan and Ohio are substantially the same as those in Missouri and Arkansas. I have no objection to the appropriation as originally contemplated, but that was my reason and the only reason I had.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the point of order withdrawn or is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw the point of order I made against it.

Mr. OLIVER. I renew the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes that if the point of order is made the amendment has to go out.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 68, line 12, after the word "Porto Rican," strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$50,000" and the following language:

Of which sum \$10,000, or so much as is necessary, may be expended for the maintenance of a substation for experiments on the introduction and growth of tropical and other vegetables, fruits and fruit trees, and the packing and shipping of their products, in the event that the government of Porto Rico, either by itself or through individuals or organizations, provides for the station a tract of land of not less than 50 acres of suitable land, together with buildings acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in relation to that amendment I desire to say that there are many Americans who have gone to Porto Rico, who are developing a fruit industry there. The experiment station to be established has been estimated for by the department, and they recommend this addition of \$10,000; but it is made a condition that the people there should donate 50 acres of land and suitable buildings to be placed on it.

It seems to me wise for the Government to do this, inasmuch as it gets such a large donation from individual citizens who are very much interested in the project. A year or so ago I had a separate bill before the Senate providing for the same thing, but I could not get it through in that form.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I notice, in reading the Senator's amendment, that not only \$10,000 but the whole \$50,000, under the wording of the amendment, might be used for the purpose indicated.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; the amendment proposes to strike out the figures "\$40,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000," so as to provide for this additional sum, which will be used for nothing else than the purpose indicated.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is, it provides for the appropriation of \$10,000 or "so much as may be necessary." It does not say "so much thereof as may be necessary" of the \$10,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, I will ask that the word "thereof" be inserted, so that it will read "so much thereof as may be necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have another amendment of the same character relating to Hawaii. There is a recommendation of the department that \$50,000, instead of \$40,000, which has been estimated for, should be appropriated; and the same conditions prevail there, except there is already a change there. The amendment provides an additional amount, with a provision that the additional sum shall be used for agricultural extension work in Hawaii. I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 68, in line 12, after the word "Hawaii," it is proposed to strike out "\$40,000" and to insert "\$50,000."

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STONE. And the Committee on Agriculture recommended an appropriation of \$40,000?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They approved the item of \$40,000 when it came from the House, but since then the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended both in the case of the Porto Rican item and the Hawaiian item an increase of \$10,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is in view of the donation to the Government of certain lands and buildings to carry out the purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That was provided as to Porto Rico, and that amendment has been adopted. The amendment I now offer relates to Hawaii.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I notice that there are about 18 Senators present. Apparently it is the disposition of a goodly number of the 18 who are present to offer amendments increasing the sums carried by this bill. As one member of the committee, I must protest against this situation. I am not criticizing the individual Senators who offer amendments to increase appropriations, but I think it is due to the Senate as a legislative body that it should know something about the constant increases that are being put upon the bill after the Senate has adopted the committee amendments and after the Committee on Agriculture has had an opportunity to perform, and I assume has performed, its functions.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have not the slightest interest in this amendment, except for the fact that I am also a member of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and feel by reason of that fact that there ought to be some interest manifested in behalf of the people of Porto Rico and Hawaii, who have no representatives on this floor. Consequently I have deemed it proper to offer the amendment. I am perfectly willing that the Senator should be heard before the conferees, and if this amendment is not wise I do not want it adopted any more than he does. I have no interest in the matter and I do not know a single man who is going to be benefited by it.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, it is becoming a custom to legislate by conferees. There are a good many things here that I should like to have heard discussed with reference to this bill, for it seems to be the intention to try to put it through now with all these amendments without any discussion of any character that could be called a discussion at all. I think I am going to be compelled, sir, to—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before the Senator does that—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will withdraw the amendment if the Senator is going to call for a quorum. I would rather withdraw the amendment than to see the Agricultural bill defeated.

Mr. FALL. I do not want to defeat the Agricultural bill, either, but I think the Senate would be attending strictly to its business if it were to adjourn over until to-morrow, and we had a quorum here then to consider this bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that there is no effort whatever to rush anything through. The only reason I asked that we might go on with the consideration of this measure was to make an effort legitimately to conserve time.

Mr. FALL. But one amendment after another is being offered by Members after the committee itself has had its amendments all considered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So far as that is concerned, the Senator has no right to shut off any of the amendments that I, as chairman of the committee, offer.

Mr. FALL. I have no right to shut off anything, and I have no desire to shut off anything.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am endeavoring to facilitate the passage of the measure. Senators who have offered amendments to the bill, of course, think they are meritorious, but the Senators present can take what action they see fit in reference to them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will admit that these amendments were not presented before the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will admit that; but they have come here just as other amendments have come that have been offered upon the floor of the Senate which have not been submitted to the committee.

Mr. FALL. There is an attempt to get the bill through, and I have no desire to stand in the way of the passage of the bill and getting it out of the way, so that other legitimate business may be brought before the Senate; but I do not like to be appealed to just at the very last moment, when we are working to try to pass this bill, to consider the amendments that come in now, offered by members of the committee one after another, each one increasing an appropriation when we can not have any proper discussion of them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will withdraw the Hawaiian amendment if the Senator will not call for a quorum.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there are other amendments to be offered, and I appeal to the Senator from South Carolina, as we have had a long and strenuous day and I think this bill can be finished in half an hour to-morrow, that he consent to an adjournment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will suggest to the Senator that I am not attempting to carry anything through. I have seen an amendment that the Senator has to propose, and one other amendment which is also to be proposed, and I think the merits of both, as I have seen them, would make them appeal to most Senators who are here so that perhaps they would not need to be discussed at any length.

Mr. KENYON. They would not appeal to very many Senators at this hour.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the merits of those amendments will appeal to Senators.

Mr. KENYON. I think the amendment I intend to propose will be adopted, but I think it will require discussion.

Mr. FALL. It undoubtedly will. Here is a pending amendment as to which I have received 100 telegrams from county agents, agricultural colleges, and others in my State, and I know that the Senate has been flooded with telegrams in reference to the proposed amendment to be added to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the amendment the Senator proposes is of such a character that not a single member of the committee will object to it. It is of such a nature that I think the mere reading of it will commend it to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Yes; but there is being an enormous pressure brought to bear upon Senators here to have them reject that amendment.

Mr. KENYON. And there are not over 18 Senators here now to consider it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that amendment will be incorporated in the bill, because it is, after all, the very provision that we incorporated in the bill in 1914, and which had been in the bill every year since 1906.

Mr. FALL. The acting chairman of the committee will admit that it must be explained; it must be discussed to some extent; it can not be simply accepted, adopted, and incorporated in this bill. I want to ask some questions about it myself, although I am in favor of the amendment; but I want to bring out the truth of the matter in such form that the people who are protesting against the adoption of the amendment can understand the reasons for it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me a moment, if the amendment to which Senators are speaking is going to take a long time, I ask them to let me offer a couple of amendments which will only take a minute or two.

Mr. FALL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 8, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.